

60-4

*COLLECTION OF PURITAN AND
ENGLISH THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE*



LIBRARY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

500

Theological Seminary
At Princeton N. J.

✓
THE
NOTES
OF

The Church,

As Laid down

By Cardinal *BELLARMIN*;

Examined and Confuted.

With a Table of the Contents.


IMPRIMATUR,

Apr. 6.
1687.

Guil. Needham.

L O N D O N ;

Printed for Richard Chiswell, at the Rose and Crown
in *St. Paul's* Church-Yard, MDCLXXXVIII.



THE SEVERAL TRACTS

Contained

IN THIS VOLUME.

1. **A** Brief Discourse concerning the Notes of the Church; with some Reflections on Cardinal *BELLARMIN*'s Notes.
2. An Examination of *BELLARMIN*'s First Note concerning, [*The Name of Catholick.*]
3. —His Second Note, [*Antiquity.*]
4. —His Third Note, [*Duration.*]
5. —His Fourth Note, [*Amplitude or Multitude and Variety of Believers.*]
6. —His Fifth Note, [*The Succession of Bishops.*]
7. —His Sixth Note, [*Agreement in Doctrine with the Primitive Church.*]
8. —His Seventh Note, [*Union of the Members among themselves and with the Head.*]
9. —His Eighth Note, [*Sanctity of Doctrine.*]
10. —His

- 10.—His Ninth Note, [*Efficacy of the Doctrine.*]
11.—His Tenth Note, [*Holiness of Life.*]
12.—His Eleventh Note, [*The Glory of Miracles.*]
13.—His Twelfth Note, [*The Light of Prophecy.*]
14.—His Thirteenth Note [*Confession of Adversaries.*]
15.—His Fourteenth Note, [*The Unhappy End of the
Church's Enemies.*]
16.—His Fifteenth Note, [*Temporal Felicity.*]
17. A Vindication of the Brief Discourse concerning
the Notes of the Church; in Answer to a Late
Pamphlet, Intituled [*The Use and great Moment
of the Notes of the Church, as delivered by Cardi-
nal Bellarmin (de Notis Ecclesiæ) Justified.*]
18. A Defence of the Confuter of *Bellarmin's* Second
Note of the Church [*Antiquity*] against the
Cavils of the Adviser.
19. A TABLE of the Contents.

A BRIEF
DISCOURSE
Concerning the
NOTES
OF THE
CHURCH.

With some *REFLECTIONS* on
Cardinal BELLARMIN'S Notes.

LICENSED,

April 6. 1687.

JO. BATTELY.

L O N D O N ;

Printed for Ric. Chiswell, at the *Rose and Crown* in
St. Paul's Church-Yard. MDCCLXXXVII.

1917

1918

1919

1920

1921

1922

A BRIEF DISCOURSE

Concerning the

Notes of the CHURCH, &c.

IF Cardinal *Bellarmin* had not told us, That this is a *most profitable Controversie*; I should very much have wondered at that Pains which he and so many other of their great Divines have taken, to find out the Notes of the Church. For is not the Catholick Church visible? And if we can see which is this Church, what need we guess at it by Marks and Signs? and that by such Marks and Signs too, as are matter of dispute themselves? Cannot we distinguish between the Christian Church, and a *Turkish* Mosque, or *Jewish* Synagogue, or *Pagan* Temple? Cannot we, without all this ado, distinguish a Christian from a *Turk*, or a *Jew*, or a *Pagan*? And it will be as easie to find out a Christian Church, as it is to find out Christians; for a Christian Church is nothing else but a Society of Christians united under Christian Pastors, for the Worship of Christ; and where ever we find such a Society as this, there is a Christian Church, and all such Particular or National Churches all the World over, make up the whole Christian Church, or the Universal Church of Christ.

*Controv. T. 2.
L. 4. de Notis
Ecclesie.*

But this will not do the Cardinal's business; Tho' the Christian Church is visible enough, yet not such a Church as he wants. For since there are a great many Christian Churches in the World, as the *Greek*, the *Armenian*, the *Abyssine*, the *Roman* Church, he would find out which of these Churches is the Catholick Church; which after all their shuffles they can never make any better sense of, than which of the Parts is the Whole.

Since there are many unhappy Disputes among Christians, the use of Notes is to find out an Infallible Church, which must by an indisputable Authority dictate to all other Churches, what they must believe, and what they must practise; and to bring all other Churches into subjection, they must find out a Church, out of whose Communion there is no pardon of Sin, no eternal Life to be had. That is, in short, the use of Notes is to prove the Church of *Rome* to be the only Catholick Church, the only Infallible Oracle of Faith, and final Judge of Controversies; and that the Promises of Pardon of Sin, and Eternal Life, are made only to the Church of *Rome*, and to those other Churches which are in subjection to her. Thus *Bellarmin* unriddles this matter, that the usefulness of this Inquiry after the Notes of the true Church, is, because *in the true Church only there is the true Faith, true remission of Sins, the true hope of Eternal Salvation*; which is certainly true, that all this is to be had only in the true Church of Christ. For there can be no true Church without the true Faith; and no remission of Sins, nor hope of Salvation out of the true Church. But then all the Churches in the World, which profess the true Faith of Christ, are such true Churches. But this will not do the business neither; for it is not enough to know that every true Church professes

*Omnes enim
constituntur in so-
lâ verâ Ecclesia
esse veram fidem,
veram peccato-
rum remissionem,
veram spem sa-
lutis eternâ.
Bell. de Notis
Eccles. cap. 1.*

professes the true Faith; but we must find out such a Church, as cannot err in the Faith, and has Authority to correct the Faith of all other Churches; and we must allow the pardon of Sin, and Eternal Life, to be had in no other Church but this; which is the only thing, which can make such a Church the Mistress of all other Churches; and this Church must be the Church of *Rome*, or else the Cardinal is undone with all his Notes and Marks of the Church.

The observing this, gives us the true state of this Controversie; which is not, what it is which makes a Church a true Church; which is necessary for all Christians to know, that they may take care, that nothing be wanting in their Communion, which is essential to a true Church; which is the only use of Notes that I know of: but the dispute is, how among all the divisions of Christendom, we may find out that only true Church, which is the Mistress of all other Churches, the only Infallible Guide in Matters of Faith, and to which alone the promises of Pardon and Salvation are made; and by some Notes and Characters of such a Church, to prove, that the Church of *Rome* is that Church. The first of these is what the Protestants intend in those Notes they give of the true Church; to show what it is which is essential to the being and constitution of a Christian Church; for that, and none else, is a true Church, which has all things essential to a true Church. The second is, what the *Papists* intend by their Notes of a Church; to prove, that the Church of *Rome* is the only true Church: and some brief Remarks upon both these ways, will abundantly serve for an Introduction to a more particular Examination of Cardinal *Bellarmin's* Notes of the Church, which.

which is the only design of these Papers.

It is no wonder, that *Papists* and *Protestants* differ so much about the Notes of the true Church, since the Questions which each of them intend to answer by their several Notes, so vastly differ. When you ask a Protestant, What are the Notes of a true Church? He answers to that Question, What it is which is essential to a true Church; or what it is which makes a Church a true Church; that is, *What a true Church is?* And examines the truth of his Church by the essential marks and properties of a Church. When you ask a *Papist* for Notes of a true Church, he answers to that Question, *Which is a true Church?* and thinks to point you out to a true Church by some external Marks and Signs, without ever inquiring what it is which is essential to a Church; and this he must of necessity do, according to his Principles; for he can know nothing of Religion till he has found the Church, from which he must learn every thing else. Let us consider then which of these is most reasonable.

First, To begin with the *Protestant* way of finding out the Church by the essential Properties of a true Church; Such as the profession of the true Christian Faith, and the Christian Sacraments rightly and duly administered by Persons rightly ordained, according to the Institution of our Saviour, and the Apostolical Practice. This is essential to a true Church; for there can be no true Christian Church without the true Christian Faith, and Christian Sacraments, which cannot be rightly administered but by Church-Officers rightly and duly ordained. The Regular Exercise of Discipline is not necessary to the being of the Church, but to the Purity and good Government of it.

*

This

This is the sum of what the Protestants alledg for the Notes of the true Church, and these are as infallible Notes of a true Church, as Humane Nature is of a Man; for they are the Essential Principles of it. By this every Man may know whether he be a Member of a true Church or not; for where this is, there is a true Church; where this is not, there is no true Church, whatever other Marks of a Church there be. And I know no other use of Notes, but to find out what we seek for.

In answer to such Notes as these, Cardinal *Bellarmin* objects three things.

1. That Notes, whereby we will distinguish things, must not be common to other things, but proper and peculiar to that of which it is a Note. As if you would describe a Man to me, whom I never saw, so as that I may know him when I meet him; it is not enough to say, that he has two Hands, or two Eyes, &c. because this is common to all Men. And this he says is the fault of these Notes: For as for *the sincere preaching of the Truth*, or the Profession of the true Christian Faith, this is common to all Sects, at least in their own Opinion; and the same may be said of the Sacraments. All Sects and Professions of Christians, either have the true Faith and Sacraments, or at least think that they have so; and therefore these Marks cannot visibly distinguish the true Church from any other Sect of Christians.

Now I must confess, these Notes, as he well observes, are common to all Christian Churches, and were intended to be so: and if this does not answer his Design, we cannot help it. The Protestant Churches

Churches do not desire to confine the Notes of the Church to their own private Communion; but are very glad, if all the Churches in the World be as true Churches as themselves. The whole Catholick Church, which consists of a great many particular Dioceſan, or National Churches, has the ſame Nature; And when the whole conſiſts of univocal parts, every part muſt have the ſame Nature with the whole: And therefore as he who would deſcribe a Man, muſt deſcribe him by ſuch Characters as fit all Mankind; ſo he who gives the Eſſential Characters of a Church, muſt give ſuch Notes as fit all true Churches in the World. This indeed does not fit the Church of *Rome*, to make it the only Catholick, and the only true Church, nor do we intend it ſhould; but it fits all true Churches, where-ever they are, and that is much better.

To answer then his Argument, when we give Notes, which belong to a whole Species, as we muſt do, when we give the Notes of a true Chriſtian Church; (there being a great many true Churches in the World, which make up the Catholick, or Universal Church) we muſt give ſuch Notes as belong to the whole kind; that is, to all true Chriſtian Churches. And though theſe Notes are common indeed to all true Chriſtian Churches, yet they are proper and peculiar to a true Chriſtian Church; as the Eſſential Properties of a Man are common to all Men, but proper to Mankind: And this is neceſſary to make them true Notes; For ſuch Notes of a true Church, as do not fit all true Churches, cannot be true Notes.

As for what the Cardinal urges, That all Sects of Christians think themselves to have the true Faith, and true Sacraments; I am apt to think they do; but what then? If they have not the true Faith, and true Sacraments, they are not true Churches, whatever they think of it; and yet the true Faith, and true Sacraments, are certain Notes of a true Church. A Purchase upon a bad Title, which a Man thinks a good one, is not a good Estate; but yet a Purchase upon a Title, which is not only thought to be, but is a good one, is a good Estate. All that can be said in this case, is, That Men can be no more certain, that they have a true Church, than they are, that they have a true Faith, and true Sacraments; and this I readily grant. But as Mens Mistakes in this matter, does not prove, that there is no true Faith, nor true Sacraments; so neither does it prove, that a true Faith, and true Sacraments, are not Notes of the true Church.

2. The Cardinal's second Objection is, That the Notes of any thing must be more known than the thing it self; which we readily grant. Now says he, which is the true Church, is more knowable than which is the true Faith: and this we deny, and that for a very plain reason, because the true Church cannot be known without knowing the true Faith: for no Church is a true Church, which does not profess the true Faith. We may as well say, that we can know a Horse, without knowing what the shape and figure of a Horse is, which distinguishes it from all other Creatures, as that we can know a Christian Church, without knowing what the Christian Faith

is, which distinguishes it from all other Churches : or we we may as well say, that we can know any thing without knowing what it is, since the very Essence of a true Church consists in the true Faith, which therefore must be first known before we can know the true Church.

But the Cardinal urges, that we cannot know what true Scripture is, nor what is the true interpretation of Scripture, but from the Church ; and therefore we must know the Church before we can know the true Faith. As for the first, I readily grant, that at this distance from the writing the Books of the New Testament, there is no way to assure us, that they were written by the Apostles, or Apostolical Men, and owned for inspired Writings, but the Testimony of the Church in all Ages. But herein we do not consider them as a Church, but as credible Witnesses. Whether there be any such thing as a Church, or not, we can know only by the Scriptures : But without knowing whether there be a Church or not, if we know, that for so many Hundred Years, these Books have been owned to be written by such Men, and have been received from the Apostles Days till now, by all who call themselves Christians, this is as good an Historical Proof as we can have for any thing ; and it is the Authority of an uninterrupted Tradition, not the Authority of the Church, considered as a Church, which moves us to believe them : For setting aside the Authority of Tradition, how can the Authority of a Company of Men, who call themselves the Church, before I know whether there be any Church, move me to believe any thing which was done 1600 years ago ? But there is a Company of Men in the
World,

World, and have been successively for 1600 years, (whether they be a Church or not, is nothing to this question) who assure me, that these Books which we call the Scriptures, were written by such inspired Men, and contain a faithful Account of what Christ did, and taught, and suffered; and therefore I believe such Books; and from them I learn what that true Faith is which makes a true Christian Church.

As for the true Interpretation of Scripture, that we cannot understand what it is, without the Church, this I also deny. The Scriptures are very intelligible to honest and diligent Readers, in all things necessary to Salvation: and if they be not, I desire to know, how we shall find out the Church: for certainly the Church has no Charter but what is in the Scripture: and then if we must believe the Church before we can believe or understand the Scriptures, we must believe the Church, before we can possibly know whether there be a Church or not. If we prove the Church by the Scripture, we must believe and understand the Scripture, before we can know the Church: If we believe and understand the Scriptures upon the Authority and Interpretation of the Church, considered as a Church, then we must know the Church before the Scripture. The Scripture cannot be known without the Church, nor the Church without the Scripture, and yet one of them must be known first; and yet neither of them can be known first, according to these Principles, which is such an Absurdity, as all the Art of the World can never palliate.

3. The Cardinal's third Objection is, That the true Notes of the Church must be inseparable from it; whereas the Churches of *Corinth* and *Galatia* did not

always teach true Doctrine, some of the Church of *Corinth* denying the Resurrection, and the *Galatians* warping towards *Judaism*; and the Church of *Corinth* being guilty of great Miscarriages in receiving the Lord's-Supper; and yet were owned for true Churches by the Apostles. An Argument which much became the Cardinal to use, it being the best Evidence I know of for the Church of *Rome* being a true Church, that every Corruption in Faith and Sacraments do not Unchurch; but how this proves that true Faith and true Sacraments are not an essential Note and Character of a true Church, I cannot guess, I would desire any one to tell me for him, whether a corrupt Faith and false Sacraments be the Notes of a true Church; or whether it be no matter as to the Nature of a Church, what our Faith and Sacraments are?

Secondly, Let us now consider the Cardinal's Way, by some certain Marks and Notes, to find out which is the true Church, before we know what a true Church is. To pick out of all the Churches in the World, one Church, which we must own for the only true Church, and reject all other Churches, which do not subject themselves to this one Church. To find out such a Church on whose Authority we must rely for the whole Christian Faith; and in whose Communion only Pardon of Sin is to be had. That this is the use of Notes in the Church of *Rome*, I have already shewn you; and truly they are very pretty things to be proved by Notes; as to consider them particularly:

I. To find out which is the true Church, before we know what a true Church is. This methinks is not a natural way for Inquiry, but is like seeking for we know
not

not what. There are two Inquiries in order of Nature before *which is the true Church*, viz. Whether there be a true Church or not, and what it is. The first of these the Cardinal takes for granted, that there is a Church; but I won't take it for granted, but desire these Note-makers to give me some Notes to prove, that there is a Church. There is indeed a great deal of talk and noise in the World about a Church, but that is no proof, that there is a Church; and yet it is not a self-evident Proposition that there is a Church; and therefore it must be proved. Now that there is a Church, must be proved by Notes, as well as which is this true Church, or else the whole design of Notes is lost; and I would gladly see those Notes, which prove that there is a Church, before we know what a Church is. To understand the Mystery of this, we must briefly consider the Reason and Use of Notes in the Church of *Rome*; according to the Popish Resolution of Faith into the Authority of the Church, the first thing we must know, is, which is the True Church; for we must receive the Scriptures, and the Interpretation of them, and the whole Christian Faith and Worship, from the Church; and therefore can know nothing of Religion, till we have found the Church. The use then of Notes is to find out the Church before, and without the Scriptures; for if they admit of a Scripture proof, they must allow that we can know and understand the Scriptures without the Authority or Interpretation of the Church, which undermines the very Foundation of Popery: Now I first desire to know how they will prove, That there is a Church without the Scripture? That you'll say is visible it self, for we see a Christian Church in the World;
but:

but what is it I see ? I see a Company of Men who call themselves a Church, and this is all that I can see ; and is this seeing a Church ? A Church must have a Divine Original and Institution ; and therefore there is no seeing a Church without seeing its Charter ; for there can be no other Note or Mark of the Being of a Church but the Institution of it.

And this proves, that we cannot know, that there is a Church, without knowing in some measure what this Church is ; for the Charter which founds the Church, must declare the Nature and Constitution of it, what its Faith and Worship, and Laws and Priviledges are. But now these essential Characters of a Church must not be reckoned by the *Romanists* among the Notes of a Church, for then we must find out the true Church by the true Faith, and the true Worship ; not the true Faith by the true Church ; which destroys Popery.

Hence it is, that these Note-makers never attempt to give us any Notes, whereby we shall know that there is a Church, or what this Church is ; for there are no Notes of these, but such as they dare not give, *viz.* The Authority of the Scriptures, and every Man's private Judgment of the Sense and Interpretation of them ; for at least till we have found a Church, we must judg for our selves, and then the Authority of the Church comes too late ; for we must first judg upon the whole of Religion, if we must find out a true Church by the true Faith, before we can know the true Church ; and we cannot rely on her Authority, before we know her ; and therefore they take it for granted, that there is a Church, which they can never prove in their way, and attempt to give some
Notes

Notes whereby to know which is the Church ; and then learn, what the Church is, from the Church herself ; which is like giving Marks whereby to know an Unicorn, before I know whether there be an Unicorn or not, or what it is.

2. Another Blunder in this Dispute about Notes is, That they give us Notes whereby to find out the true Catholick Church, before we know what a particular Church is. For all *Bellarmin's* Notes are intended only for the Catholick Church ; and therefore his first Note is the Name *Catholick* ; whereas the Catholick Church is nothing else but all true Christian Churches in the World, united together by one Common Faith and Worship, and such Acts of Communion as distinct Churches are capable of, and obliged to. Every particular Church which professes the true Faith and Worship of Christ, is a true Christian Church ; and the Catholick Church is all the true Christian Churches in the World ; which have all the same Nature, and are in some sense of the same Communion : So that it is impossible to know what the Catholick Church is, before we know what a particular Church is, as it is to know what the Sea is, before we know what Water is : Every true, single, particular Church has the whole and entire Nature of a Church, and would be a true Church, though there were no other Church in the World ; as the Christian Church at *Jerusalem* was, before any other Christian Churches were planted : and therefore there can be no other Notes of a True Church, but what belongs to every true particular Church, and that can be nothing but what is essential to a Church, and what all true Christian Churches in the World agree in, viz.
The

The True Faith and Worship of Christ.

Now, so far as *Bellarmin's* Notes belong to every true particular Church, so far we allow them, and let the Church of *Rome* make the best of them She can; for we doubt not to make our Claim to them, as good, and much better than hers; but he has named very few such; the *6th*, the Agreement and Consent in Doctrine with the Ancient and Apostolick Church, which is the same with his second Note concerning Antiquity, which must refer to the Antiquity of its Doctrine; for an Ancient Church, tho founded many years since, if it have innovated in Doctrine, cannot plead Antiquity, and a Church founded but yesterday which professes the Ancient Faith may: and the *8th* the Holiness of its Doctrine, are the chief, if not the only Notes of this Nature; and these we will stand and fall by. Many of his other are not properly the Notes of a true Church, any otherwise than as they are Testimonies of the Truth of common Christianity, which is professed by all true Churches; and if they are Notes of the Church, so every true particular Church has a share in them. Such as his *9th*, the Efficacy of Doctrine. The *10th*, the Holiness of the Lives of the first Authors and Fathers of our Religion; and I suppose the Holiness of Christ and his Apostles give Testimony to the truth of common Christianity, and therefore to all Churches who profess the common Faith once delivered to the Saints. The *11th* the Glory of Miracles, which also proves the truth of Christian Religion; and I hope a little better than Popish Miracles do Transubstantiation. The *12th*, is the Spirit of Prophecy, which as far as it is a good Note, belongs to the Religion, not to the Church. Other Notes he assigns, which I doubt will prove no

Notes

Notes at all, as 13, 14, 15, because they are not always true, and at best uncertain.

His third and fourth Notes are not Notes of a Church, but God's Promises made to his Church: as of a long Duration, that it shall never fail, and Amplitude or Extent, and multitude of Believers. These Promises we believe God will fulfil to his Church, but they can be no Notes, which is the true Church. For the first of these can never be a Note till the day of Judgment. That Church which shall never be destroyed is the true Church, but a bare long continuance is no Mark of a true Church; for an Apostatical Church may continue by the patience and forbearance of God many hundred Years, and be destroyed at last; and then this Argument of a long Duration is confuted: And as for Amplitude and Extent, that is not to distinguish one Christian Church from another, that the most numerous Church should be the truest; but to distinguish the Christian Church from all other Religions; and then I doubt this Prophecy has not received its just Accomplishment yet; for tho we take in all the Christian Churches in the World, and not exclude the greatest part of them, as the Church of *Rome* does, yet they bear but a small proportion to the rest of the World.

And now there are but three of his fifteen Notes of the Church left. The first concerning the Name *Catholick*, which makes every Church a Catholick Church, which will call it self so: Tho Catholick does not declare what a Church is, but in what Communion it is, and is no Note of a true Church, unless it be first proved, that they are true Churches, which are in Communion with each other: For if three parts in four of all the Churches in the World were very cor-

rupt and degenerate in Faith and Worship, and were in one Communion, this would be the most Catholick Communion, as Catholick signifies the most general and universal; but yet the fourth part, which is sincere, would be the best and truest Church, and the Catholick Church, as that signifies the Communion of all Orthodox and Pure Churches.

His fifth Note is, *the Succession of Bishops in the Church of Rome from the Apostles till now.* This is a Note of the Roman Church; and the Succession of Bishops in the Greek Church, is as good a Note of the Greek Church. And any Churches which have been later planted, who have Bishops in Succession from any of the Apostles or Apostolical Bishops, by this Note are as good Churches as they. So that this is a Note common to all true Churches, and therefore can do the Church of *Rome* no Service.

His seventh Note indeed is home to his purpose: That that is the only true Church, which is united to the Bishop of *Rome*, as to its Head. If he could prove this, it must do his business without any other Notes, but that will be examined hereafter. But it is like the Confidence of a Jesuit, to make that the Note of the Church, which is the chief Subject of the Dispute.

The Sum is this: There can be no Notes of a true Church, but what belong to all true Churches: for tho there is but one Catholick Church, yet there are a great many true particular Churches, which make up this Catholick Church, as homogenous Parts, which have all the same Nature. But now very few of the Cardinal's Notes belong to all true Churches; and those which do so, signifie nothing to his purpose, because they are common to more Churches than the Church of *Rome*. And as for the Catholick Church, that is known only

only by particular Churches ; for it is nothing else, but the Union of all True Churches in Faith and Worship, and one Communion, as far as distinct Churches at a great distance from each other are capable of it : And therefore there is no other way to know which is the Catholick Church, but by knowing all the true Churches in the World, which either are in actual Communion with one another, or are in a Disposition for it, whenever occasion is offered : For it is impossible that all true Christian Churches all the World over, should ever join in any visible and external Acts of Communion : and therefore tho we know and believe, that there is a Catholick Church, because we are assured that all true Churches in the World are but one Church, the one Body and Spouse of Christ ; yet it is next to impossible to know all the Parts of the Catholick Church (without which we cannot know the whole Catholick Church) because we cannot know all the particular true Churches all the World over. Nor indeed is there any need we should : For we may certainly know which is a truly Catholick Church, without knowing the whole Catholick Church. For every Church, which professes the true Catholick Faith, and imposes only Catholick Terms of Communion, and is ready, out of the Principles of Brotherly Love and Charity (that Cement of Catholick Communion) to communicate with oth Churches, and to receive all Churches to her Communion upon these Terms, is a truly Catholick Church, which shews how ridiculous it is to make the Catholick Church our first Inquiry, and to pretend to give Notes to find out the true Catholick Church by, before we know what a true Particular Church is. But the Mystery of this will appear more in what follows.

3dly, For another Mystery of finding the true Church by Notes, is to pick out of all the Christian Churches in the World one Church, which we must own for the only Catholick Church; and reject all other Churches as Heretical, or Schismatical, or Un-catholick Churches, who refuse Obedience and Subjection to this One Catholick Church. For if this be not the Intent of it, what will all the Notes of the Church signify to prove, that the Church of *Rome* is the only true Catholick Church? And if they do not prove this, the Cardinal has lost his labour. For tho the Notes he assigns were the Notes of a true Church, yet they may and must belong to all other true Churches, as well as to the Church of *Rome*; unless he can prove, that there is but One true Church, or but One Church, which is the Mistress of all other Churches, and the only Principle and Center of Catholick Unity. And this ought to have been proved first, before he had thought of the Notes of the Church.

So that there are many things to be proved here, before we are ready for the Notes of the Church. They must first prove, that there is but one true Church in the World: for tho we all grant, that there is but One Catholick Church, yet we say, there may be, and hope, nay more than so, know that there are many true Churches, which make up the Catholick Church. Yet before the Notes of a true Church can do any Service to the Church of *Rome*, they must prove, that there is but one true Church in the World; and then it will signify something to prove the Church of *Rome* to be that true Church.

They must prove also, that the Catholick Church does not signify all the particular true Churches that are in the World; but some one Church, which is the
Fountain

Fountain of Catholick Unity ; which all other Churches are bound to submit to, and communicate with, if they will be Members of the Catholick Church. For tho all the Churches in the World were in Subjection to that Church, yet they receive their Catholicism from their Communion with that Church ; and therefore that only is the Catholick Church. It is not meerly the Communion of all Churches together, which makes the Catholick Church ; but it is the Subjection of all Churches to that one Catholick Church, which makes them Catholick : So that they must prove, that there is one particular Church, which is the Catholick Church ; that is, that a part is the whole ; that one particular Church is all the Churches of the World ; for so the Catholick Church signifies in Ancient Writers. This is so absurd, that some of our Modern Advocates for the Catholick Church of *Rome* tell us, that they do not mean the particular Diocess of *Rome* by the Catholick Church ; but all those Churches, which are in Communion with the Church of *Rome* : But suppose this, yet it is only the Church of *Rome* which makes all the other Churches Catholick, and therefore she only is the Catholick Church. And I will presently make them confess it to be so : For let us suppose, that no other Churches should submit themselves to the Church of *Rome* (by the Church of *Rome* understanding the particular Diocess of *Rome*) would she be the Catholick Church or not ? If notwithstanding this she would be the Catholick Church ; then it is evident, that they make the particular Church of *Rome* the Catholick Church ; if she would not, then I cannot see how Communion with the Church of *Rome* is essential to the Catholick Church.

These things, I say, ought to have been proved, before the Cardinal had given us the Notes of the Church ; for

it is a hard thing to prove by Notes, that the particular Church of *Rome* is the only Catholick Church, till it be proved, that a particular Church may be the Catholick Church, or that there is one particular Church, which is the Catholick Church. This he knew we all deny; and it is a ridiculous thing to think to convince us by Notes, that the Church of *Rome* is the particular Catholick Church; when we deny that there is any such Church; and affirm, that it is a Contradiction to own it; as great a Contradiction, as it is to say, that a Particular Church is the Universal Church.

4^{thly}. But when I consider the farther Design of these Note-Makers, to find out such a Church on whose Authority we must rely for the whole Christian Faith, even for the Holy Scriptures themselves, it makes me more admire, that they should think this could be done by some Notes of a Church; especially by such Notes as the Cardinal gives us.

For suppose he had given us the Notes of a *true Church*, which is the utmost he can pretend to; before we can hence conclude that this Church is the Infallible Guide, and uncontrollable Judg of Controversies, we must be satisfied, that the true Church is Infallible. This indeed *Bellarmin* attempts to prove in his third Book of the Church; and it is not my Concern at present to inquire how he proves it. But I am sure this can never be proved but by Scripture; for unless Christ have bestowed Infallibility on the Church, I know not how we can prove she has it; and whether Christ have done it or not, can never be known but by the Scriptures: So that a Man must believe the Scriptures, and use his own Judgment to understand them, before it can be proved to him, that there is an Infallible Church; and therefore those who resolve the belief of the Scriptures in-

to the Authority of the Church, cannot, without great Impudence, urge the Authority of the Scriptures to prove the Church's Infallibility; and yet thus they all do; nay prove their very Notes of the Church from Scripture, as the Cardinal does: and think this is no Circle neither, because we Hereticks believe the Scriptures without the Authority of their Church, and therefore are willing to dispute with them out of the Scriptures. But this is a Fault on our side, and when we dispute with them, whatever we do at other times, we should not believe the Scriptures, till they had proved them to us their way, by the Authority of their Church; and then we should quickly see what blessed Work they would make of it. How they would prove their Church's Infallibility, and what fine Notes we should have of a Church, when we had rejected all their Scripture-proofs, as we ought to do, till they have first satisfied us, that theirs is the only true Infallible Church, upon whose Authority we must believe the Scriptures, and every thing else. I confess, I would gladly hear what Notes they would give a Pagan to find out the true Infallible Church by.

It is certainly a most senseless thing to resolve all our Faith into the Authority of the Church, as if the Church were the first Object of our Faith in Religion; whereas it is demonstrable, that we must know and believe most of the Articles of the Christian Faith before we can know whether there be any Church or not. The order observed in the Apostles Creed is a plain Evidence of this; for all those Articles which are before the Holy Catholick Church, must in order of Nature be known before it. That there is a God who made the World; that Jesus Christ is the only begotten Son of God, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary,

Mary, suffered under *Pontius Pilate*, was crucified, dead, and buried, and descended into Hell, that he rose again the third day from the dead, and ascended into Heaven, and sitteth on the Right-Hand of God the Father Almighty, and from thence shall come to judge the Quick and the Dead; I believe in the Holy Ghost; and then we may add the Holy Catholick Church, and not till then. For the Church is a Society of Men for the Worship of God, through the Faith of Jesus Christ, by the Sanctification of the Holy Spirit, which unites them into one Mystical Body: So that we must know Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, before we can know what the Catholick Church means. And is it not strange then, that our Faith must be founded on the Authority of the Church, when we must first know all the great Articles of our Faith, before we can know any thing about a Church. This inverts the order of our Creed; which according to the Principles of the Church of *Rome* should begin thus. I believe in the Holy Catholick Church, and upon the Authority of that Church, I believe in God the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost: and no doubt but the Apostles, or those Apostolical Men, who framed the Creed, would have put it so, had they thought the whole Christian Faith must be resolved into the Authority of the Church.

This short Discourse, I think, is enough in general concerning the Notes of the Church; and I shall leave the particular Examination of *Cardinal Bellarmin's* Notes to other Hands, which the Reader may expect to follow in their order.

T H E E N D.

BELLARMIN'S First Note of the Church concerning the Name of *Catholick*, E X A M I N E D.

Prima Nota, est ipsum Catholica Ecclesia & Christianorum nomen.
Bellar. cap. 4. de notis Ecclesiæ. p. 1477.

I M P R I M A T U R,

Apr. 8. 1687.

Guil Needham RR. *in Christo P.*
ac D. D. Wilhelmo Archiep.
Cant. a Sac. Domest.

THat the sincere Preaching of the Faith or Doctrine of Christ, as it's laid down in the Scripture, is the only, sure, Infallible Mark of the Church of Christ, is a Truth so clear in it self, so often and fully prov'd by Learned Men of the Reformation, that it may justly seem a Wonder, that any Church, which is not conscious to her self of any Errors and Deviations from it, should refuse to put her self upon that Tryal: This gave Being to the Church of Christ at first, makes it One and makes it Catholick. According as this fares in any Part or Member of it, is that Church distinguish'd and denominatèd; it will be True or False, Pure or Corrupt, Sound or Heretical, according as the Faith it holds bears a Conformity or Repugnance to the written Doctrine of our Saviour: An

D

Ortho-

Orthodox Faith makes an Orthodox Church, but if her Faith become Tainted and Heterodox, the Church will be so too; and should it happen wholly to Apostatize from the Faith of Christ, it would wholly cease to be a Christian Church. This may seem to be the Reason, that the present Church of *Rome*, being notoriously warp'd from Truth, declines the being examined and measur'd by this Rule, (having indeed some reason to be against the Scripture that is so evidently against her) and endeavours to support her self with great Names and Swelling Titles: Hence it is that we so often hear of the *Name of Catholick, Antiquity, Amplitude, Unity, Succession, Miracles, Prophecy*, and several others that their great Cardinal sets down, as so many perpetual and never-failing Marks and Characters to find out the True Church, and to Assert his own.

I shall in this short Tract examin the first of these, and that I may give it all the fair play imaginable, endeavour to represent it in its full Force, and to its best Advantage; *Bellarmin* makes it thus to speak for it self: *The Apostle in 1 Cor. 3. 4. makes it the Sign and Mark of Schismatics to be called after the Name of particular Men, tho' of the Apostles themselves, whether of Paul or Apollos or Cephas: And in the Writings of the ancient Fathers, the Orthodox Churches were known and distinguish'd by the name of Catholick, and the Conventicles of Schismatics and Hereticks, by the Names of their first Authors: And therefore since the Church of Rome is by all even her bitterest Adversaries, called Catholick, and the several Sects of the Reform'd, after the Names of their particular Doctors, as Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, and the like; it follows that the Name of Catholick is not only a sure undoubted Mark of the true Church, but also that this Church of Rome is that Church: This is his Argument; and as much as he values his Church upon it, I can*

can see no more in it but this, that because Churches professing *the true Orthodox Faith*, were anciently styl'd Catholick, therefore all that have been styl'd Catholick since, *be their Faith what it will*, must be True and Orthodox Churches: And because the Apostle forbids Christians to be call'd after the Name of particular Men, tho of never so great Eminency in the Church: And those mentioned in the Works of the Ancients were really Schismatics and Hereticks, *that were so call'd*, as the *Valentinians*, *Marcionites*, *Montanists*, and others: Therefore all that in after-Ages shall be so nick-nam'd, tho out of Malice and Ill-will by their Enemies, whilst they disown it themselves, must go for Schismatics and Hereticks. This is so weak a Topick, that I might justly break off here, having expos'd it sufficiently by a bare Representing of it: Yet for the Reader's farther Information and Satisfaction in this matter, I shall proceed to shew these three Things.

- I. *In what Respect the Name of Catholick was esteemed by some of the Fathers in their Time, a Note of a Catholick Church, and in what Respects 'twill ever be a standing Note of it.*
- II. *That from the bare Name of Catholick, no Argument can be drawn to prove a Church to be Catholick.*
- III. *That the Church of Rome having egregiously corrupted the true Catholick Faith, neither is nor deserves the Name of a Catholick Church.*

- I. *In what Respect the Name of Catholick was esteemed by some of the Fathers in their Time, a Note of the Catholick Church, and &c.*

And this, as evidently appears from their Writings, and even from those Testimonies cited by Bellarmin,

was upon the Account of the Catholick Faith; that in their Time was generally and for the most part in conjunction with the Name of Catholick; and when ever it is so, 'twill be an Infallible Note of a Catholick Church. The Catholick Faith is that which was deliver'd by Christ himself to his Apostles, and by them to the Church, contain'd in those Writings, which they by the extraordinary Direction and Assistance of the Holy Ghost indited, and commended to the Care and Keeping of all the Churches planted by them, as a sure unerring Rule of Faith and Manners; *Call'd Catholick*, both as it contains all things in it necessary to Salvation, and as it was to be preach'd and publish'd in all Times, and successively in all Places: According to *Vincent. Lirin.* Rule, *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus creditum est*: It set out at *Jerusalem*, but was not to stop there, but from thence to spread it self into all parts of the World. The Apostles were first to preach to the lost Sheep of the House of *Israel*, but not to them only; *Go, teach all Nations*, was our Saviour's Commission to the Apostles; and, *I will give thee the Heathen for thine Inheritance*, and *&c.* was God's Promise to our Saviour. The Christian Church was not to be confin'd within the Limits of one Nation, like that of the *Jews*, within the small Territories of *Judea*, but to be made up of *every Kindred, and Tongue, and People, and Nation*.

Now in the first Ages of Christianity, before the main Body of the Church was divided, only some few misled and seduc'd People separating from it, it being generally true, that they *that bore the Name of Catholick*, profess the *true Catholick Faith*, and those that were called after the Name of particular Men, had deprav'd and corrupted it, the very Name Catholick became a distinguishing Note of a true Church, and to be call'd after the

the Name of the Author of any Sect, the Mark of an Heretical and Scismatical one; but yet this was not so much for the Sake of the bare Names, as for the Things, the Tenets and Doctrines signified by them. In this Sense are all those Fathers to be understood, quoted by *Bellarmin* and others, who seem to lay any stress upon the Name: 'Twas upon the Account of the true Catholick Faith, that in those Times did for the most part, if not every where, accompany and go along with the Name: Thus when *St. Cyril of Jerusalem* advis'd his Catechumens, when they should go into any City, to enquire for the Catholick Church, he gave this Reason for it, *because there the true Catholick Faith is taught*, and in the same place adds, *The Church is therefore call'd Catholick, because it teaches all those Truths all Men are bound to know in order to Salvation*; and upon the same Account, *Pacianus* not unfitly said, *Christian is my Name, and Catholick my Sirname; by the one I am distinguished from Heathens, by the other from Hereticks and Scismaticks*: because in that Age few or none went by the Name of Catholick, but those that were so indeed, and profess the true Catholick Faith. And as this is a true Account of the Original of *the Name Catholick*, and the weight that was laid upon it in those early Times, so will the Name ever continue to be a sure unerring Note of the Catholick Church, whilst it is inseparably conjoyn'd with the Profession of the Catholick Faith: Where this is taught and profess'd, there's a true Church; where this fails in part or in whole, the Church decays, or is lost.

Cap. 18.
Catech.

Epist. ad Syn.
pron. de nom
Cath.

II. *No Argument can be drawn from the bare Name of Catholick to prove a Church to be Catholick.*

This is so clear and evident in it self, that it neither needs nor is scarce capable of a Proof; *The Church of Rome*

Rome is call'd *Catholick*, therefore she is *Catholick*; The *Papists* are call'd *Catholicks*, therefore they are *Catholicks*: This is such a way of Reasoning, that every Man must be asham'd to own, but those who have the confidence to say any thing, when they are not able to say any thing to the Purpose. For,

1. The Christian Church was not known by the Name of *Catholick* at the beginning, and therefore it can be no Essential Note of it. We find no mention of this Name in the Writings of the New Testament: We read, *That the Disciples were called Christians at Antioch*; but the name *Catholick*, principally respecting the diffusive Nature of the Church, the Church could not properly be so called, till the Christian Faith had been more generally and universally preach'd in the World: Therefore *Pacianus* in the fore-quoted Place confesses, that the Name *Catholick* was not us'd in the Church in the Days of the Apostles; and from thence some have concluded, that the Creed which goes under the Apostles Name, having this Denomination of the Church inserted in it, *Catholick Church*, was not compos'd by them, but by some Holy Bishops of a later standing in the Church; yet must it be confess'd that the Name is very ancient and of an early Date, it being found in the Oriental Creeds, particularly those of *Jerusalem* and *Alexandria*, and in the Inscriptions of *St. James*, *St. Peter*, *St. John*, and *St. Jude's* Epistles, which are all styl'd General or *Catholick* Epistles.

2. Names are oftentimes arbitrarily and at random, and falsely impos'd on Things, and therefore nothing can be concluded from them: The Church of *Sardis* had a Name to live, but was dead; the Church of *Laodicea* gloried that she was rich, but was poor; many on Earth are call'd Gods, who are but mortal Men; *Simon Magus* was call'd the great Power of God, but was a Child of the

the Devil; *Mahomet* a great Prophet, but was an *Impostor*; *Diana* the great Goddess of the *Ephesians*, but was an *Idol*; our Blessed Saviour foretold that many should come in his Name, each saying, I am *Christ*, but were *Deceivers*. Thus, you see, Things and Persons are not always as they are call'd; nor do I believe the Papists are willing that their Church should be thought in reality to be, according to the signification of some Names that are too liberally bestow'd upon her; the Bishop of *Rome* calls himself *Christ's Vicar*, but others, *Antichrist*; the Church of *Rome* styles her self the *Catholick Church*, but others, the *Whore of Babylon*. I do as little justify the fastening such odious Names upon them, as approve their arrogating to themselves the other glorious Titles; yet this I am pretty well assur'd of, that a Man of ordinary Abilities may say as much to prove the *Pope*, *Antichrist*, and the *Romish Church*, an *Harlot*; as the whole Colledg can to justify the pretence of the one to be *Christ's Vicar*, or of the other, to be his *undefiled Spouse*.

3. Names are oftentimes impos'd on things, and so us'd, as Marks of Distinction only, without any farther design of representing their Natures and Qualities by them; thus we call the Romanists *Catholicks*, not that we think they are truly so, but in Complement, or Irony, in compliance with common use, or by way of Discrimination from other Christians; and in the same respects, it may be suppos'd, that they call us the *Reform'd*: And if they think this is a good Argument to prove them *Catholicks*, we have the same, and 'twill hold as strong, to prove us *Reform'd*. They call us the *Reformed*, therefore we are *Reformed*, is as good an Argument as, we call them *Catholicks*, therefore they are *Catholicks*: In this Sense are those Words of St. *Austin*, cited by *Bellarmin*, to be understood; *That should a Stranger happen into any City to enquire*

The First Note of the Church,

enquire even of an Heretick, where he might go to a Catholick Church; the Heretick would not dare to send him to his own House or Oratory. Not that that Heretick did believe, that those that there were call'd Catholicks, did hold the true Catholick Doctrine, for then he could not have believ'd his own; but looking upon it as a bare Name of Distinction, he directed him to that Assembly of Christians, that were so called. *St. Austin* seems here to suppose a Case, as if a Traveller entring into a City, where both Popish and Reform'd Churches were allowed, and should chance to meet a Protestant, and of him enquire the way to a Catholick Church, and he direct him to a Popish one; or a Papist, and of him enquire the way to a Reform'd Church, and he direct him to a Protestant one: It would not therefore follow, that either the one or the other did believe either Church to answer and correspond with its Name, that the Popish was Catholick, or the Protestant Reformed; but that they were Words of vulgar use, whereby they might be known from one another, but not the true Church from the false.

III. It does not follow, that because the Name of Catholick in that time, when it was for the most part in conjunction with the Catholick Faith, was a sure Note of a true Church, it must always be so, even when the Name and thing are parted. It was not long before the Christian Church became miserably torn and rent asunder, divided into many and some very great Bodies, all pretending to *Catholicism*. By what Mark now is the Catholick Church to be known? Not by the Name surely, when all Parties laid claim to it, and the grossest Hereticks, such as the *Manicheans* themselves, as *St. Austin* tells us, who had the least to shew for it, coveted and gloried in it. Have never any Hereticks or Scisma-

ticks been styled Catholicks? Nor ever any Orthodox styl'd Hereticks? The Greek Church is call'd Catholick, and yet the Church of *Rome* will have her an *Heretical one*: The *Donatists* appropriated to themselves that ample Title; and yet St. *Austin* thought them no better than Schismatics: The *Arians* call'd themselves *Catholicks*, and the *Orthodox*, *Homosians* and *Athanasians*; but neither the one was the more, nor the other the less Catholick for what they were call'd. Truth is always the same, and the Nature of things remains unalterable, let Men fix on them what Names they please: By this Rule then is the true Church to be known, not because it bears the Name of *Catholick*, for that a Church may do, and yet be guilty of *Schism* and *Heresie*, but because it professes the true Faith, and then tho it be in name *Heretick*, it is in reality *Catholick*; This is *Lactantius's* Rule, to discern the true Church by the true Religion; *That Church alone*, says he, *is Catholick, that retains the true Worship of God*. And St. *Austin* in his Disputes with the *Donatists*, where the true Church was, appeals to the Scripture, as the only Infallible Judg: Amongst many others to this purpose, he hath these Words, *I say this, and thou sayest that, but thus saith the Lord*.

5. Again, does it follow, that because, the being called after the Names of particular Men, in that Age, when all so call'd were for the most part corrupt in the Faith, was a sure Brand of Schismatics and Hereticks, it must ever be so? May not Names and Titles be unjustly and maliciously impos'd? If the Churches of the Reformed must go for Hereticks & Schismatics, meerly because they are distinguish'd by the Names of those Men that were the first and most eminent Instruments in that blessed Work, as of *Lutherans*, *Calvinists*, *Zynglians*, & the like; Is there not the same Reason that the several Orders

Instit. lib. 4. c. ult. Sola Catholica est quæ verum cultum retinet.

Non audiamus, hæc dico, hæc dicis, sed audiamus hæc dicit Dominus; &c.

Ibi quæramus Ecclesiam.

Epist. 166. de unit. Eccl. c. 2.

in the Church of *Rome*, that go under the Names of their particular Founders, as the *Benedictines*, *Franciscans*, *Dominicans*, *Jansenists*, and *Molinists*, and others, be esteemed so too? If there be any Difference, the advantage of Reason is on our Side; since the Reformed assume not those Names to themselves, and tho they deservedly honour the Memories of those Men, and with thankful Hearts embrace the Reformation God was pleas'd by their Ministry to make in the Church, yet do they by no means affect to be call'd after their Names: They own no Name but *Christian* or *Catholick*, when it signifies Persons adhering to the true *Catholick Faith*: The others are Nick-names fasten'd on them by their Adversaries out of Scorn or Malice, to represent them to the World, (as far as they are able) as so many *Schismatics* from the *Catholick Church*, and as having other Leaders than Christ and his Apostles: But those in the Church of *Rome* that are denominated from their particular Founders, give themselves those Appellations, seem to prefer them before that truly *Catholick* one of *Christian*, which while with some neglect they leave to the Common People, they glory and pride themselves in the other; so that if this Note of an Heretick is valid, it turns with great Force against themselves, who are really guilty of it, and not against us, whom they will make guilty of it, but are not.

III. *The Church of Rome having egregiously corrupted the Catholick Faith or Religion, neither is, nor deserves the Name of a Catholick Church.*

Whether she is guilty of this or no, will be best seen by comparing her Doctrine in several Points with that delivered by Christ, and left upon Record by his holy Apostles;

postles; for tho the Church of *Rome* will not allow the Scriptures to be the whole and a perfect Rule of Faith and Manners, yet they acknowledg them to be the Word of God; and granting that, they must acknowledg that all those Doctrines and Practices that are forbidden by them, are Corruptions and Depravations of it. Let us then bring their Faith to the Touchstone; How readeſt thou?

See Dis-
course of the
Object of
Religious
Worship.
1685.

The Scripture ſays, *Thou ſhalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve, Mat. 4. 10.* Which Words evidently appropriate all kinds, and all degrees of Religious Worship unto God, they being an answer to the Devil's Temptation, who requir'd but the lowest Degree; the Devil acknowledging that the right he had of disposing of the Kingdoms of the World to be only derivative not natural, (*they were delivered to me.*) At the same time confessed himself not to be the Supream God, and consequently cannot be suppos'd to claim the highest degree of Worship.

See Dis-
course con-
cerning In-
vocation of
Saints.
1684.

The Scripture ſays, *How ſhall they call on him, in whom they have not believed?* Making God alone the Object of Prayer, who is the only Object of Mens Faith and Confidence. *Rom. 10. 14.*

Two others
in 1686.

The Scripture ſays, *There is one God, and one Mediator between God and Man, the Man Christ Jeſus,*

The Church of *Rome* ſays, that Angels and Saints are to be wor-ship'd and pray'd unto; *Catech. Rom. par. 3. c. 2. n. 8, 9.*

Tho with an inferior kind of worship, not the same that's given to God. *Ibid.*

The Church of *Rome* ſays, *It's good and profitable to pray to Saints and Angels.* Concil. Trid. Sess. 25. de Invocat.

The Church of *Rome* prays to Saints as Inter-cessors, and teaches that

fus, who gave himself a Ransom for all, 1 Tim. 2. 5, 6.

God bestows many Favours upon Men by their *Merit, Grace and Intercession.* Catech. Rom. par. 3. c. 2. n. 12.

See particular examination of Monsieur de Meaux in the Articles of Invoc. of Saints and Worship of Images. 1686.

The Scripture says, as it is in the Second Commandment, *Thou shalt not make to thy self any graven Image, nor the likeness of any thing, &c. Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them,* Exod. 20. 4. Where, we see, all use of Images in the worship of God, whether Carved or Painted, are expressly forbidden without any Exception or Distinction.

See Treatise on Search the Scriptures. 1585. As also the Lay-Christian's Obligation to read the Scriptures. 1687.

The Scripture commands all Persons indifferently, *to read, to search, to meditate on the Scriptures, that the Word of God dwell in them richly in all Wisdom,* Luk. 16. 29. John 5. 39. Psal. 1. 2. Col. 3. 16.

The Church of Rome requires that *due Worship and Veneration be given to them*, such as *Kissing, uncovering the Head, and falling down before them*: and denounces a Curse against those that think otherwise. *Concil. Trid. Sess. 25. Catech. Rom. par. 3. c. 2. n. 24.* And then to cover the Shame and Guilt of this, claps the Second Commandment to the First, and by making it of the same sense with that, makes it to have none of its own, nor of any signification.

The Church of Rome allows not this Liberty to the Laity, but upon Licence, that is not easily to be obtained, and says that *more hurt than good comes by the reading of them.* Reg. Ind. libr. Prohib. Reg. 4. Nay, a Liberty to read them under such a Restriction was thought too much, and therefore the Faculty of granting such Licences was by the Order of Pope Clement the 8th quite taken away. Reg. Ind. libr. Prohib. Auct. Sexti 5. & Clem. 8. Obser. circa 4. regul.

See Disc.
of Divine
Service in
an unknown
Tongue.
1685.

The Scripture expressly forbids Prayers in an unknown Tongue, as altogether unprofitable and unedifying in the Church. 1 Cor. 14. 2. *He that speaks in an unknown Tongue, speaketh not unto Men, ver. 11. If I know not the meaning of the Voice, he that speaketh shall be a Barbarian unto me. ver. 16. If thou shalt bless with the Spirit (by the gift of an unknown Tongue) how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say, Amen, at the giving of thanks, since he understands not what thou sayest?*

The Scripture says, *Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord, they rest from their Labours, Rev. 14. 13. To Day, said our Saviour to the repenting Thief on the Cross, shalt thou be with me in Paradise, Luk. 23. 43.* And Paradise is acknowledged by them to be a place of Peace and Joy. *Bellar. de Sanct. Beat. l. 1. c. 3. Test. 4.*

The Church of Rome strictly enjoyns such and no other, viz. *in the Latin Tongue*, and denounces a Curse against those, who say, that Divine Service ought to be administred only in *the vulgar Tongue. Concil. Trident. Sess. 22. c. 8. & Can. 9.* Hereby making the People perform to God an unreasonable Service, whilst it takes from them the knowledg of the Prayers offered in their Name, and suffers them not to understand their own Devotions.

The Church of Rome says, that Souls who die in a state of Grace, but are not sufficiently purg'd from their Sins, *go first into Purgatory*, a place of Torment bordering near upon Hell; from which yet their Deliverance may be expedited by their *Suffrages*, that is, *Prayers, Alms, and Masses*, said and done by the Faithful that are alive, in their behalf. *Bellar. de Purgat. l. 2. c. 6. Catech. Rom. par. 1. c. 6. n. 3. Concil. Trid. Sess. 25. Decret. de Purgat.*
Now

The

Now how *this resting from their Labours, and being in Paradise,* can be consistent with the Pains and Fire of Purgatory, which *Bel-larmin* tells us is hotter than Hell it self, is past my Apprehension.

The Scripture says, that *the Blood of Jesus Christ the Son of God, cleanseth us from all Sin,* 1 Joh. 1. 7. And that God for Christ's sake hath *forgiven us all our Trespases,* Eph. 4. 32. Col. 2. 13.

The Church of Rome says, that Souls are to continue in Purgatory till they have made full satisfaction for their Sins, and are thoroughly purged from them; and that whoever says, that there is no Debt of temporal Punishment to be pay'd either in this World or in Purgatory, before they can be admitted into Heaven, is accursed. *Concil. Trid. Sess. 6. Can. 30.*

See Dis-
course of the
Communion
in one kind,
in answer to
Monsieur de
Meaux.
1687.

The Scripture says, that when our Saviour instituted the blessed Sacrament of his Body and Blood, he commanded it to be administred and receiv'd in both kinds, the Cup as well as the Bread, saying, *Drink ye all of this.* Mat. 26. 27. Neither were the Disciples any more Priests when they took the Cup, than when they received the Bread; for if they were *made Priests* by our Saviour's

The Church of Rome says, the Cup is not to be administred to the Laity, and gives many Reasons for it, *lest the Blood of Christ should be spilt; lest the Wine kept for the Sick should fret; lest Wine may not always be had, or lest some may not be able to bear the smell or taste of it.* Whether these are sufficient Reasons or no, the Council of Trent enjoyns all to believe them so, under an Anathema. *Concil. Trid. Sess. 21. Can. 1. & 2.* The Council of *Constance* acknowledges that our Saviour instituted the Sacrament

our's pronouncing these Words, *Do this in Remembrance of me*; they became so, before they had taken, at least before they had eaten the Bread, as well as before they had received the Cup; It not appearing, that Christ made any Pause betwixt his saying, *Take, eat, This is my Body*, and his saying, *Do this in Remembrance of me*, but spake them as it were in a Breath, as one continued Sentence; and then upon this account the whole Sacrament, the Bread as well as the Wine, must belong only to the Priests.

in both kinds, and that it so continued in the Church of Rome many Centuries, and yet, with a *Notwithstanding* to both these, it sacrilegiously robs the People of the Cup. *Concil. Const. Sess.* 13.

See Discourse of Transubstantiation. 1685.

The Scripture says, that the *Bread and Wine* in the Sacrament, even after Consecration, is *Bread and Wine still*, 1 Cor. 11. 26, 27. And it is very evident, that when our Saviour said, *This is my Body*, he meant it only as the Representation of his Body; a manner of Speech well understood by the Jews, who commonly

The Church of Rome says, that the *Bread and Wine* in the Eucharist, by the Priests pronouncing these Words, *Hoc est corpus meum*, is transubstantiated into the natural Body and Blood of Christ; the Species or Accidents only of the Bread and Wine remaining, and hath made it an Article to be believed by all under an Anathema; *Concil. Trid. Sess. 13. de Real. Praef. c. 1. Cornel. a Lapide* tells us, that it was the Opinion of

Another of the Real Presence, Sec. in Answer to two Discourses from Oxford, 1687.

monly said the same of some of their grave Divines, thing of the Paschal Lamb: They call'd it that this Change is made after so *the Body of the Passover*, powerful and effectual manner, whenas it was but the that if Christ had not been incarnated before, the force of this Memorial, a Figure usual in Sacraments, and indeed essential to them. Charm would have incarnated him, and cloath'd him with Human Nature.

Adeo potenter & efficaciter, ut si Christus necdum esset incarnatus, per hæc verba (hoc est Corpus meum) incarnaretur, Corpusque humanum assumeret. Cornel. a Lapid. Com. in Esa. c. 7.

The Scripture says, The Church of Rome says, that *Christ needed not* in the Sacrifice of the Mass Christ *daily, as those High* is offered as often as that is celebrated; and that tho therein he be *Priests, to offer up Sacrifice, &c. for this he did* unbloodily offer'd, yet it is a true propitiatory Sacrifice for the Sins *once, when he offer'd up* both of the Living and Dead. *himself, Heb. 7. 27. And* *that without Blood there* *Conc. Trid. Sess. 22. Cap. 1.* And declares the Person accursed that *is no Remission of Sin,* denies any part of this. *Ibid.* *Heb. 9. 22.*

In all these Particulars, you see (and several other might be instanc'd in) the Faith and Doctrine of the Church of Rome bears a manifest repugnance to the Gospel of Christ. Now if the Holy Scripture may be allow'd so much as to be a Rule of Faith and Manners in those things it particularly treats of, the Church of Rome contradicting that Rule in those things, must be condemned for a Corrupter of the Christian Faith or Doctrine. And having thus made it evident that she holds not the true Catholick Faith, 'tis as evident that she is not, and consequently deserves not to be called a Catholick Church.

T H E E N D.

L O N D O N,

Printed by J. D. for Richard Chiswell at the Rose and Crown in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1687.

The Second Note of the CHURCH
 EXAMINED,
 VIZ
 ANTIQUITY.

Secunda Nota est ANTIQUITAS. Bellar. L. iv. c. v.
 de notis Ecclesiæ.

IMPRIMATUR,

Apr. 5. 1687.

JO. BATTELT.

IT is a shrewd sign that a Church is in an ill Case, when the most learned and witty Defenders of it, commend it to the World by such Marks and Characters, whereby they say it may be known; as are neither proper to it alone, nor in Truth belong to it: But more truly and evidently belong to them whom they oppose.

That this is the Case of the present Church of *Rome*, in that Famous Note of ANTIQUITY, which *Bellarmin* and others, make a Mark of the true Church, I will clearly and distinctly demonstrate, by shewing these *three* Things.

I. That the Plea of bare Antiquity, is not proper to the Church, but common to it with other Societies, of false Religion.

F

II. That

II. That true Antiquity is not on the side of the present Roman Church. But,

III. That it is truly on Ours.

I. It is confessed by all, even by them who make Antiquity a Mark of the Church, that the *Notes* of a Thing must be *proper* to that of which they are a Note, and not *common* to it with other Things: Which quite destroys this Note of *Antiquity*, upon a double Account.

First, Because that which is proper to a Thing is inseparable from it, and did ever belong to it since it had a Being; and can at no Time, without the destruction of its Being, be absent from it. This every Fresh-Man in Learning knows; and by that may know, that Antiquity is not a Note proper to the Church, because it did not always belong to the Church: For there was a Time when the Church was New. Which was objected to it by the Adversaries of our Religion: and the Defenders of the Church answered the very same to them then, that we do to the Romanists now; as will appear in the second Thing I have to observe.

Secondly, That other Societies have laid claim to this Note, and it could not be denied them; and therefore 'tis not a proper Note, whereby the true Church may be certainly known: being common to it, with others that are not of the Church.

1. For, first, the *Samaritans* claim'd it against the *Jews*, as appears from the Womans Discourse with our Saviour, Joh. iv. 20. *Our Fathers worshipped in this Mountain, &c.* They had done so, for many Ages before they worshipped in *Jerusalem*. For here God appeared unto *Abraham*, who here also built an Altar when he came first out of *Chaldea*, Gen. xii. 6, 7. Here *Jacob* likewise built an Altar when he came out of *Mesopotamia*, Gen. xxxiii. 20..

Here

Here there was a *Sanctuary* in the Days of *Joshua*, who gave his last- Charge to *Israel*, and made a Covenant with them, in this Place, *Chap. xxiv. 25, 26.* Here the Patriarchs were buried, *v. 32.* Nay, hereabouts was *Shiloh* (*Judg. xxi. 19.*) where, by the order of *Joshua*, the Tabernacle, and the Ark of God were settled; long before it was brought to *Jerusalem* (*Josh. xviii. 1, 2.*) which was all this time in the Hands of the *Jebusites*. To which Plea the Jews could not make an Answer, but by maintaining this Principle; That *not the Antiquity of Place, but the Authority of God's Precept, was to be their direction in this Case.* And God, it appeared by the Holy Books, had chosen *Jerusalem* to place his Name there.

2. Thus the *Jews* themselves argued against Christ; that he did not follow the Tradition of the Elders, which had been derived to them from ancient Times, *Mark vii. 1, &c.* and against Christians, whom they called the *Sett of the Nazarens*, *Acts xxiv. 5.* as much as to say, Hereticks, newly sprung up from *Jesus of Nazareth*.

3. And thus the *Pagans* argued against them both: particularly against the Christians, saying to *St. Paul* at *Athens*, May we know what this *New Doctrine*, whereof thou speakest, is? *Acts xvii. 19.* And in after-times calling it, a *Novel Religion*, a *Novel Name*; and disputing that their Religion was the truer, because they were *strengthened and defended by the Authority of Antiquity.*

So we read in *Arnobius* (a), and in *Symmachus* (b), (a) Lib. 2. and *Prudentius* (c), and many others, whom I omit; (b) Ad Valentin. Theodof. & Arcad. contenting my self with *St. Austin* alone, because he gives a most pertinent Answer to this poor Pretence; (c) In Agone which will aswell serve us against the *Papists*, as it did *Romani Martyris.*

(d) Quæst. ex
Vet. & Novo
Testament. Q
cxiv.

him against the Pagans (d). *Who contended that what they held was true, because of its Antiquity. As if, faith he, Antiquity, or ancient Custom should carry it against the Truth. Thus Murderers, Adulterers, and all wicked Men may defend their Crimes; for they are ancient Practices, and began at the beginning of the World. Though from hence they ought rather to understand their Error; because that which is reprehensible and filthy, is thereby proved to have been ill begun, &c. nor can it be made honest and un-reproveable, by having been done long ago.*

But this is a part of the Devil's Craft and Subtilty (as he excellently observes in the same Place) *who as he invented those false Worship, and sprinkled some juggling Tricks to draw Men into them; so he took such course, that in process of time the Fallacy was commended, and the filthy Invention was excused, by being derived from Antiquity: For by long Custom that began not to seem filthy, which was so in it self. The irrational Vulgar began to worship Demons, or dead Men, who appeared to them, as if they had been Gods: Which Worship being drawn down into Custom of long Continuance, thinks thereby to be defended, as if it were the Truth of Reason. Whereas the Reason of Truth is not from Custom (which is from Antiquity) but from God; who is proved to be God, not by long Continuance (or Antiquity) but by Eternity.*

Let this be applied to our present Business, and it is sufficient to shew, that *bare Antiquity* cannot be a Note of Truth: For there are very ancient Errors. Which is so evident, that it is a Wonder such a Man as *Bellarmin* was, should let this pass the Muster among the Notes he reckons up, of the Truth of his Church; which he could intend for no more than to make a show, not for any substantial Service: Of which this is a Demonstration, that he had no sooner named *ANTI-QUITY*,

QUITY, as the *Second* Note of the Church, but, discerning it would stand him in no stead, he immediately sets it aside, and cunningly slides to another thing; with which he endeavours to blend and confound it. For thus he argues, *Without doubt the true Church is ancienter than the False; as God was before the Devil: And consequently we read the good Seed was sown first before the Tares.*

But who doth not see, that these two things are widely different, the one from the other; *Antiquity*, and *Priority*; that which is *Ancient*, and that which is *First*? Whatsoever is *First*, is undoubtedly true; but whatsoever is *Ancient*, is not always so; unless it be of such Antiquity, that it be also *First*. There is a double Antiquity therefore; one in respect of us; the other absolute and in it self. This last sort of Antiquity is the same, with what is *First*: Unto which we are desirous to go, to which we are willing to stand, and by which we would be judged. By the Rule, which *Tertullian* lays down in several of his Books, * We would fain bring our Cause and Church to be tryed; *That is truest which was First; that First, which was from the Beginning; that from the Beginning, which was from the Apostles: And in like manner, that from the Apostles, which in the Churches of the Apostles was most Sacred, viz.* That which they read in their Holy Writings. *This is our Antiquity* (as he speaks in his famous Apology) *præstructa divine literaturæ* †, *built before upon the Divine Learning.* *This is the Rule of Faith, which came from Christ, transmitted to us by his Companions; to whom all those who speak other ways, will be found to be of later date.*

* L. iv. contra Marcion. c. 5. Adv. Præxiam. c. 2. De præscript. c. xxx.

† Apologia c. xlvii.

But to this they of the Church of Rome will by no means agree; they do not like to be tryed only by the Holy Scriptures, which is the true Antiquity; that is,

un-

undoubtedly *First*, before all other Traditions. A very bad Sign this; an Infallible Note all is not right among them, that they dare not abide by the Scriptures; but cry up other Traditions: that is, boast of what is *later*, not what is *first*. And what is after the *First*, though it could be proved to be of great Antiquity, cannot certainly be relied on: Because there are Errors and Heresies so ancient that they sprung up presently after the *first* Truth.

Mere Antiquity therefore, is not a good Proof. For though the Devil be not *first*, yet he is of great *Antiquity*: being *the old* (ὁ ἀρχαῖος) that ancient *Serpent*; who was a Liar, as well as a Murderer *from the Beginning*. And was so crafty, as in Process of Time, to make use of this Argument, to prove he was the *Ancient of Days*, that is, God. And if there had not been something else, whereby he might have been discovered to be a Serpent; who could have contradicted him? Or confuted his Doctrine and Worship, if they had been to be tried by bare Antiquity? Which is a Proof so insufficient, that God Himself, as ye heard before out of St. *Austin*, is not proved to be God by *Antiquity*, but by *Eternity*.

Truth and Error were born so near together, that after a long Tract of Time, they could not be distinguished merely by their Age. No sooner was Man created, but this Serpent, by his Subtilty, beguiled *Eve*. And immediately after our Redemption, he attempted again to corrupt Mens Minds from the simplicity that is in *Christ*, 2 Cor. xi. 3. 1 Theff. iii. 5. And accordingly, as there was a *Church of Christ*, so there was, together therewith, a *Synagogue of Satan*, Rev. iii. 9. There were *Depths of Satan* also, and a Mystery of Iniquity (which wrought even in the Apostles Days) as well as

a Mystery of Godliness, and the deep things of God. Which wicked Doctrines running down to Posterity, made use, at length, of the Plea of Antiquity, to give them Countenance and Support. Nor could it be denied, tho it was proved to be a mere Deceit. For it was refuted by the Fathers in such remarkable Words as these (which give a deadly Blow to the like Plea of the present Roman Church) Custom without Truth, is but the Antiquity of Error. And there is a short way for Religious and Simple Minds to find out what is Truth: For if we return to the Beginning and Original of Divine Tradition, Human Error ceases. Thither let us return to our Lord's Original, the Evangelical Beginning, the Apostolical Tradition: And hence let the Reason of our Act arise, from whence Order and the Beginning arose.

If therefore Christ alone is to be heard, we ought not to regard, what another before us thought fit to be done, but what Christ, who is before all, first did. For we ought not to follow the Custom of Man; but the Truth of God; since God himself speaks thus by the Prophet Isaiah, In vain do they worship me, teaching the Commandments and Doctrines of Men. Which very Words our Lord again repeats in the Gospel, Ye reject the Commandments of God, that ye may establish your own Tradition. Thus St. Cyprian †.

With whom Tertullian || (whom he was wont to call his Master) agrees, in many memorable Sayings. No body can prescribe against the Truth; neither Space of Times, nor the Patronages of Persons, nor the Priviledg of Countries. From which things indeed, Custom having gotten a Beginning, by Ignorance or Simplicity, and being grown strong by Succession, pleads against Truth. But our Lord Christ calls himself the TRUTH, not CUSTOM. Nor doth Novelty so much confute Heresy, as Truth. Whatsoever is against Truth, that will be Heresy, even old Custom.

Truth

† Epist. lxxiii.
ad Cæsileum
fratrem, &
lxxiv. ad
Pomptium. Ed.
Oxon.

|| L. de Veland.
Virg. c. 1.

* L.de Anima.
c. xxviii.

*Truth doth not stand * in need of old Custom to make it be believed, nor doth Herefy fear the Charge of Novelty. That which is plainly false, is made generous by Antiquity. For why should I not call that false, whose Proof is false? Why should I believe Pythagoras, who tells Lies, that he may be believed?*

I omit all the rest; having said enough to shew, that if Antiquity it self be to be credited, we ought not to depend upon *Antiquity* alone; but seek for ancient *Truth*.

Which leads me to the *second* Thing I undertook to shew; that the present Church of *Rome* vainly pretends to true Antiquity, *i. e.* to ancient *Truth*.

II. The Antiquity of a Church doth not consist in the Antiquity of the *Place*, where it is seated: For a *new Worship* may come into an *ancient Place* of Worship; as the new Altar of *Ahaz* was introduced into the Temple at *Jerusalem*, where he sacrificed to the Gods of *Damascus*, 2 *Kings* xvi. 2 *Chron.* xxviii. 23. Nor doth it consist meerly in the Antiquity of its *Founders*: For the Apostles founded many Churches, which had all the same Title to Antiquity in this regard; and yet continued not such Churches as they left them, but decayed (some of them) so fast, that what Truth and Goodness remained among them, was ready to dye, even before all the Apostles were dead, *Rev.* iii. 2. But it's true, Antiquity consists in the Preservation of the ancient Truth, entire and uncorrupted; which it received from the Apostles, and which made it, at first, to be a Church.

Those Things are truly ancient, which persist in the same State, after a long Tract of Time, wherein they were at their Beginning. For if they have suffered any Change in that which belongs to their Being and Constitution,

stitution, they have lost their Antiquity, and become another thing, than they were at the first. Now to know this, we must enquire into the Nature of the Thing it self, and understand (for instance) what it is, that makes a Society to be the Church of God. And all agree it is the Christian Truth: In which, if it have suffered Alteration (that is, doth not hold the same Christian Doctrine it did at the beginning, but hath introduced Errors and Lies under the pretence of ancient Truth) it is not the same Church it was at first; and therefore hath not that Mark of true Antiquity, which will prove it to be such as it pretends.

Now that this is the Case of the present Church of *Rome*, is evident by that Alteration they have made in the *ancient Creed*: Unto which they have added as many more Articles as there were at the first, and thereby made such a Change in their Church (for a Change is made by adding, as well as taking away) as makes it not to be the same ancient Church, which the Apostles founded at the beginning.

This Charge they have no way to avoid, nor can by any other means maintain, that they are such an ancient Church, as Christ and his Apostles settled, but by this *Ratiocination*, as *Bellarmin* calls it. That in all great Changes of Religion, these *six* Things may be ever shewn; 1. The Author of that Change. 2. The new Doctrine that was brought in. 3. The Time when it began. 4. The Place where. 5. Who opposed it. 6. And who joined themselves to it. None of which can be shewn in the Church of *Rome*, since the Apostles times; and therefore there hath been no Change at all made in it, but it remains the same it was at first, without any Alteration.

Which is a reasoning built upon grounds so notoriously false, that it scarce deserves the Name of a poor Piece of Sophistry.

I. For first, it is contrary to all History and Experience; which shews us there have been great Changes. the Authors, and the Beginnings, &c. of which cannot now be known: Tho no Man can doubt there hath been an Alteration made. For the Body Spiritual and Civil too, is like the Body Natural: In which as there are some Diseases which make such a violent and sudden Assault, that one may say, at what moment they began: So there are other, which grow so insensibly and by such slow Degrees, that none can tell when the first Alteration was made, and by what Accident, from a good Habit of Body to a bad. Thus we are sure a Man is in a deep Consumption, when we see him worn away to Skin and Bone, though no Body can tell the precise Time when, nor by what Means, nor where and in what Company his Blood began to be tainted. And thus we are sure there is a *Gangrene* (as *St. Paul* calls Heresy) when we see it corrode the Body of the Church; tho it crept in so secretly at the first, and so indiscernably, that it was not suspected, nor can always be traced to its first Occasion and Original. No, the *Tares in the Field* (which is another Example whereby our Lord himself illustrates this matter) had taken Root before they were espied; for they were sown in the Night, while Men slept (and could take no notice of it) so that all that could be known, was this, that his Enemy had done it: That is, the Tares were not from our Saviour, nor were first sown; but were of a later and quite different Original: But by what particular Instrument the Enemy sowed them, at what Hour of the Night, by what Hand and when, did not appear; for the Matter was carried so secretly and in the dark, that the Servants, who knew of the sowing of the good Seed in the Field, wondred to see the bad, and ask'd *Whence hath it Tares?* They did not know, that is, how they came there, no more than

we may be able now to know, how Errors came into the Church: But that they were there they knew and were sure; as we are sure there are false Doctrines in the Church of *Rome*, that were not of our Saviour's planting.

2. Nor do the Examples whereby they illustrate this Ratiocination serve to any purpose, but to shew the Falseness of it. They can name, they say, the Authors and Beginnings of all the ancient Heresies; for instance, the Heresy which affirmed there were two Persons in Christ, was begun by *Nestorius* in the Year CDXXXI. Which is not true; for though then it took its Name from so great a Bishop, who maintained it; yet the Heresy had been before; from an unknown Beginning; it being mentioned by St. *Ambrose*, in the foregoing Age, in his Book of the *Incarnation*. The like may be said of the *Arian* Heresy; whose Beginning they date in the Year CCCXXIV. but it was born long before among the Gnostick Hereticks; and only got Reputation by so noted a Man as *Arius*. Nay, some of the learnedst Doctors in the present Roman Church, have taken a great deal of pains to make the World believe that *Tertullian*, and a Number of other ancient Fathers, were infected with it. So uncertain they are in their Discourses about these Matters.

3. Which if they were true, would uphold the greatest Impieties. For what will become of the Christian Religion, if the Traditional Law of the Jews be true? And according to this way of Reasoning, it must pass for Truth, that it came from Mount *Sinai* by word of Mouth, as the written Law did, for none can shew its Original, much less name the Authors of the several Traditions, and who opposed them, &c. Nay the Worship of the Heathen Gods was supported by this Argument, as is excellently observed by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, who

Admon. ad Gentiles. p. 36, 37. tells the Gentiles, “ That *Fables and Time* had advanced dead Men into the Number of the Gods. For though things present, being familiar to us, are neglected ; yet those which are past and gone, being out of the reach of Confutation, χρόνον ἀδηλία, by the obscurity and uncertainty of Times, have honour invented for them. By which means those that are dead long ago, glorying τῷ πολλῷ ἂν πλάνης χρόνῳ, in a long time of Error, are accounted Gods by Posterity.

The same may be said for the lying Oracles among them ; the Beginnings and first Authors of which cannot be traced.

4. But we have an Instance of this in the Roman Church it self; where there is an acknowledged Change, and yet they themselves are not able to tell who first began it, because it crept in by insensible Degrees. The Communion, I mean in one kind, was not used for above a thousand Years ; but being begun in some Churches (they themselves cannot tell which, nor when) grew to be a general Custom, not long before the Council of *Constance* in these Western Parts of the World ; and there was established as a Law. But it did not begin by the Decree of any Bishop, nor was carried on by any publick Order, and if you ask them, who first set it on foot ? they will tell you, that doth not appear.

Therefore the *Second* alone, of those *Six* Things, being proved, that new Doctrines and Practices have been brought in, of which we are very certain, there needs none of the rest : But we are sure there was a time, and Authors of them, and People that embraced them, tho we should not be able (for want of ancient Records that are lost, or because things that come in insensibly cannot in every Age be noted and recorded) to tell the very Time, and Place and Persons, when and where, and by whom they were introduced.

All which is not said by us, because we are not able to give an account of the other parts of that Ratiocination; but only to shew the Frivolousness of such Discourses as these, in which they of the Church of *Rome* place their main Retreat. For we can tell, nay, their own Authors have told us, when and by whom many things were brought into their Church, which were not there in the Beginning. *Polydore Virgil*, if I had room to insert his Words, would furnish us with several Instances. But I shall content my self with *Two* which were at no great distance the one from the other.

The *First* is their grand Article of Faith, about the Papal Authority. We know, and have often told them, by what steps it grew to the height, wherein now it is, or would be; when the Bishops of *Rome* began to exceed their Bounds; how they were opposed and snub'd, who, (and by whom) was first declared the Universal Bishop and Head of the Church. *Victor* began the Dance; *Zozimus*, after some others, followed it; *Boniface* continued it; *Celestine* carried it on: Who met with so sharp a Rebuke from the *African* Bishops for his intrusion into their Affairs, upon the pretence of a forged Canon of the *Nicene* Council, as is sufficient to shew his Ambition and Craft, was greater than his Authority. The Attempts of the rest are as notorious, and so is the Opposition they met withal, till at last *Boniface* the 3^d procured to himself from *Phocas*, the Title of *Universal Bishop*, and to his Church, the Title, of *Head of all Churches*. All this we can justify out of Authentick Records: but it is not in their Power to name so much as one Man that owned the Universal Jurisdiction of the Roman Bishop over the whole Church, till that Time; that is, till above six *Hundred Years* after our Saviour's Birth. For tho *Bellarmin* alledges an Epistle of *Justinians*, wherein he calls the Church of *Rome*, the *Head of all Churches*, yet it signifies

nifies nothing, but that they are at a loss for want of Proofs; because, as it is with great Reason suspected to be spurious, so it can intend no more than Head of the Churches of the West; because in an undoubted Edict of his, he calls the Church of *Constantinople* by the same Name, *the Head of all other Churches, i. e.* Chief of those in the East. Which is so certain, that their own Pope *Gregory*, not much above a year before this arrogant Title was assumed, most vehemently disdained it, or rather thundred against it. Nor can they name one Man in the whole Church for so long a time, that believed their present Definition of the Catholick Church; much less the Power of the Pope to depose Kings, which none challenged till *Gregory VII*, that is, till above a thousand years after our blessed Saviour. Inasmuch that their fore-named

† C. Bellarm.
Tract. de po-
testate. Summ.
Pontif. p. 27.

Champion † being to prove this deposing Power, out of ancient Authors, is able to say no more than this, *I have alleged above LXX famous Writers some of which flourish'd more than 500 Years ago.* A goodly Business! a glorious Shew of Antiquity! instead of the *first five hundred Years* after Christ, to refer us to the *last five hundred*: Which is to confess the Novelty of their most beloved Doctrines: And consequently to quit this Note of *Antiquity*; as in Truth he plainly doth, in that Book, where being pressed with this Argument, That no such Power was claimed in the first Times of the Church; he answers, || That he hath not right Conceptions of the Church of Christ, who admits nothing but what he reads expressly written or done in the ancient Church: For the Church of later time hath Power not only to explain, and declare, but constitute and command those Things which belong to Faith and Manners. Which is as much as to say, they need not trouble themselves about Antiquity; for they can make Articles of Faith now, which were not heard of in the Beginning.

|| Ib. cap. 3. p.
59.

2. We have often also told them by what steps Images
crept

crept into the Church. For they remained at first only in private Houses, for Ornament or for Commemoration, and not uncensured : There being above 300 Years past before they came into any Church, and then not without Opposition ; and for this end only to be of an *Historical use*, to remind People of things past. Which improved in 300 Years more, to a *Rhetorical use* (as we may call it) to stir up Devotion in the People. For which purpose *Gregory* the Great fancied they were profitable ; and tho he by no means allowed them to be worshipped, yet he thought the People might look upon them, and worship God before them. And this looking upon them to help Devotion, was improved in the time of the second *Nicene Council*, into a downright worshipping of them, which would not pass in these Western Parts for good Doctrine. And when at last (we know, and have told them by what steps) this new Worship advanced hither, and grew to a greater Degree of Religious Respect than that *Nicene Council* admitted ; the most zealous Defenders of it could not agree about it, nor do they know what to make of it to this day.

We could tell them of other Things that are much newer, for it is but a little more than 100 Years, since unwritten Traditions were decreed to be a part of the Rule of Faith, that is, of the Word of God. But this is sufficient to shew that they vainly boast of *Antiquity* ; which is only ancient Error, and some of it not very ancient neither. As for ancient Truth, that's on our side, whom they most injuriously accuse of following Novelties.

III. For the Religion of the Church of *England*, by Law established, is the true Primitive Christianity : In nothing *New*, unless it be in rejecting all that Novelty which hath been brought into the Church. But they are the Cause of that ; for if they had not introduced new

new Articles, we should not have had occasion for such Articles of Religion as condemn them. Which cannot indeed be old, because the Doctrines they condemn are new; tho the Principle upon which we condemn them is as old as Christianity: we esteeming all to be new, which was not from the Beginning. For as for our positive Doctrine, *Polydore* himself hath given a true Account of it, and makes it the Reason why the Sect called *Evangelick* (as he speaks) increased so marvelously in a short time; *because they affirmed that no Law was to be received, which appertains to the Salvation of Souls, but that which Christ or the Apostles had given* *.

* Lib. vii. c. 4.
de rerum In-
ventoribus.

And who dare say that this is a new Religion, which is as old as Christ and his Apostles? With whom who-soever agree, they are truly *ancient* Churches, tho of no longer standing than Yesterday: As they that disagree with them are *New*, tho they can run up their Pedigree to the very Apostles.

† L. de præ-
script. c. xxxii.

Thus *Tertullian* † discourses; with whose Words, something contracted, I shall conclude; *As the Doctrine of a Church, when it is divers from, or contrary unto that of the Apostles, shews it not to be an Apostolick Church, tho it pretend to be founded by an Apostle: So those Churches that cannot produce any of the Apostles, or Apostolical Men for their Founders (being much later, and newly constituted) yet conspiring in the same Faith, are nevertheless to be accounted Apostolick Churches, because of the CONSA-
N- G U I N I T Y O F D O C T R I N E.*

T H E E N D.

L O N D O N,

Printed by J. D. for Richard Chiswell at the Rose and Crown
in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1687.

The Third Note of the CHURCH EXAMINED,

VIZ DURATION.

*Tertia Nota est Duratio diuturna, nec unquam interrupta. Bellarm.
L. iv. c. vi.*

IMPRIMATUR.

Apr. 30. 1687.

GUIL. NEEDHAM.

HOW far the Church of God is beholden to the Industry of some Learned Men in the Church of *Rome*, for the Notes they give of a Church, is not my Business at present to examine: But those of the Reformed Religion must acknowledge themselves obliged to them, for so frankly quitting those Characters which are essential to every true Church, and for taking up with such as either apparently belong not to their Church, or belong to other Churches as well as theirs; or, lastly, such as may be found in a false Church as well as a true. This might easily be proved against them through the fifteen Notes which are offered by them to the World: But I shall content my self to give an Instance of it, in the Note of *Duration*, which is made by them a necessary Mark of the true Church.

H

In

In Prosecution of which, I shall consider ;

- I. What is to be understood by the Term, *Duration*.
- II. How far *Duration* may be said to be a Note of the True Church.
- III. Whether the Church of *Rome* hath a sufficient Title to this Character.

--§ I. *Duration*, according to *Bellarmin*, is the continuance of a Church throughout all Times without Interruption; and he adds, That the Catholick Church is so called, *not only because it always hath been, but also because it always will be*. So that this *Duration* doth include in it these Three things :

1. The Being of a Church from the Beginning.
2. The Continuance of that Church to the End.
3. The Continuance of that Church from the Beginning to the End without Interruption.

Let us now see how he applies it to the Case. *It's evident*, saith he, *That our Church hath continued from the Beginning of the World hitherto: Or, if we speak of the State of the New Testament, it hath endured from Christ to this Year 1557.* (The Year when he wrote this.) But for all his Beginning, *it's evident*, There is no Proof of what he Affirms, and his Assertion is very insufficient.

1. That he takes it for granted, That his Church, and the Christian Church, are one and the same, and that there is no other True Church but his. *It's evident, our Church, &c.*

2. That he has omitted Two main Branches of his *Duration*; viz. That part of it which was to the End of the World, which is as necessary a part, as that which was from the Beginning: For if the Church shall not
continue

continue to be as well as it hath been, it's not that Church which Duration is a Note of.

Again, He hath passed by that other Property of his Duration, *viz.* That it has been *without Interruption*. For, if the Church of *Rome* was from the Beginning, and hath continued, but not *without Interruption*, it wants another Property of Duration; which always was, is, and always will be, and was, and will, and must be such *without Interruption*, according to him.

§. II. How far is Duration a Note of the True Church. We grant, That there shall always be a Church of Christ upon the Earth, and that the Gates of Hell shall never finally prevail against it, so as utterly to Extinguish and Destroy it: And this we firmly believe, because Christ hath promised and undertaken for it. But though this is a Promise, and may support the Church under the most doleful Circumstances, yet it's no Note by which the True Church is to be found out, and distinguished from the False. For besides that, this Promise doth belong to the Existence of a Church, and not to this, or that Church.

1. The Nature of the Thing will not permit, that it should be a Note. For a Promise respects the Time to come, but a Note respects the Time present. The Thing promised may become a Note, when it is actually fulfill'd, but till it be fulfill'd, it can no more be a Note, than the future Time, is the present. For what a Promise is to the future, that is a Note to the present, and doth suppose the actual Existence of the Thing it is the Note of. And thus it is in the present Case: God hath promised, That he will be with his Church, and preserve it to the End of the World; but being the Period of that Duration is not to be accomplished till the end

of the World, the World must come to an End before we can know whether the Church pretending to Duration be the true Church. Suppose we for once *Bellarmin's* Church to have continued (as he saith) for the Space of 1577 Years after our Saviour, and that it could be proved to a Demonstration that it so long continued to be the same without Interruption; yet the time past, is no proof for the time to come; and if the World should continue 1577 Years after his time, and the Church nevertheless should expire before that Term; the Term of 1577 Years past, would no more answer this Character of perpetual Duration, than if it had endured but seven; for, as he saith, *Duration doth contain in it all Times, and excludes none.* And consequently, if there was a Time or Case when that Duration was interrupted (as I shall shew it was) and a Time in which that Church shall cease, to be before Time it self shall cease (as it may for ought they can say against it) then either their Church would not be the true Church, or Duration not be the Note of the true Church. For that Duration including all Times, the future Time can be no more excluded than the Time past or present; but since the future is incapable of Proof, the true Church cannot be proved by it, nor can Duration be a Note of it.

I grant indeed, That if Duration be a necessary Note of the true Church, this may be a Note by which those Churches that once were, but are now utterly extinguished, may be concluded not the true Church: but this Negative Argument will neither be able to shew which is the true Church, when there are several pretend to the like Duration: nor can be a Note of the true Church, for the Reason before given, *viz.* That it respecting the future Succession as well as the past,

past, it can be no Note till the time to come; becomes present, and the whole Period of it be accomplished.

2. That cannot be a Note of the true Church, which doth not inseparably belong to the Church in all Seasons and Cases ; for what is an essential Character of a thing, belongs to that thing when-ever and where-ever it is : And if there be any Season or Case in which that Note belongs not to it, that can be no true Note of the thing. As for instance, the Church in one House or City immediately after our Saviour's Ascension, was as much a Church from the first day it was so gathered, and had all the Qualifications of a Church, as it could have, had it been the Church of *Bellarmin*, and been existent 1577. And yet that Primitive Church so constituted, wanted this Note of Duration ; for it then but began to be. And if a Person had been to enquire for the true Church by this Character and Token, and had been taught, that that could be no Church which wanted it, he must have gone from the *upper Room* to the Temple, and have been not a Christian, but a Jew. So that we must conclude, That either the Church at that time had not all the Marks necessarily belonging to the true Church, and so indeed was no Church ; or else, that Duration is not an inseparable Note of the true Church. The former Inference is good ; because that which has not all the Marks essentially belonging to the thing, cannot be the thing which they are the Marks of ; but if that Apostolical Church had all the Marks essentially belonging to a true Church, and yet wanted at that time this Mark of Duration, then Duration cannot be an essential Note of the true Church, which was the second thing infer'd,

3. That which is a Note, must be proper to the thing which it is the Note of, and not common to other things

things as well as that (so *Bellarmin* saith, *cap. 2.*) But now this Note of Duration is common to other things, as well as the Church, to false Churches as well as the true, and so cannot be an Essential Mark of the True Church, or a Note by which it's distinguished, and to be certainly known from the False. Suppose we, that a Person that has imbibed this Principle, is in quest of the True Church, and had been living when *Luther* appear'd, and had before him the *Nestorians* and *Eutychians*, the *Armenians*, *Egyptians*, and *Ethiopians* in the East, the numerous Church of *Greece*, &c. which pretend to a Duration as good and sufficient as that of *Rome*, and the last of which is acknowledged by the Bishop of *Bitonto* in the Council of *Trent*, to be the *Mother of the Latin*, and to which the *Latin Church* owes what it hath. How shall he be able to determine where he shall fix? For to say (as *Bellarmino* doth) that they are Hereticks or Schismaticks, and that the *Greek Church* for Example, was lawfully Convicted of Heresie and Schism in three full Councils; (that is, Councils of the Church of *Rome*,) will not make them not to have been, or that the Note of Duration belongs not to them. Either then they must disprove the Duration of those Churches, or discharge it from being the distinguishing Note of the true Church.

Orat. Concil.
Trid.

De Verb. Dei
l. 2. c. ult.

De Not. c. 9.
§. dico 2do.

Lastly, I may add; If Duration be the standing Note of the True Church, Then those could be no True Churches which have not had that Duration: and so they must un-Church the Seven Churches of *Asia*, &c. which have now no Existence, but are utterly extinguished. For, if they had been True Churches, they would have had Duration; but having not Duration, they could not, according to this Doctrine, have ever been

been true Churches. But I am not willing thus to leave the Subject; and shall therefore,

§. III. Consider, Whether the Church of *Rome*, after all its pretences to Duration, and its Establishment of this Note of the True Church, has a just and sufficient Claim to it.

When we would know, whether a Church has this Note of Duration belonging to it, we must consider, What there is in a Church that is capable of being tried by this Character, and that is either as to Place, Persons, Order, or Doctrine: for by these is it that the Church doth Exist, and is made Visible; and so the Church that puts in a Claim to Duration, must be able to shew some Evidence for it from hence, as far as she admits them for Instances of that Duration she pleads for.

1. As to Place. When we hear so much of the Church of *Rome*, it's to be supposed, That *Rome* is the principal Seat of that Church, as well as the Pope of *Rome* is the Head of it. But this they cannot pretend to Duration in: for if we look backward, we find not only the City of *Rome* frequently Sack'd and Destroy'd, and wholly Depopulated, as it was by *Alaricus*, *Gensericus* and *Totylas*; but even deserted by the *Popes* themselves; who, with their whole Court, resided at *Avignon* for 70 Years together, as is acknowledged. If we look forward, All that *Bellarmino* dares to offer upon the Point, That *the Chair of St. Peter shall not be separated from Rome*, is, That it's a Pious and the most probable Opinion. But if we consult others, they say Positively, That *Rome shall depart from the Faith, and shall be an Habitation of Devils, by reason of its Wickedness and Idolatry*, and be the Seat of *Antichrist*.

Bellarmin. de Pontif. l. 4. c. 4. Ibid. §. At secundum.

Vega Jesuita in Apoc. 18. com. 7. §. 4. Rhem. Annot. in Apoc. p. 175

2. If

De Not. l. 4.
c. 8. §. dico
secundo.

2. If we proceed to Duration, as it respects Persons, where shall we expect that to be intire and uninterrupted, if not in the *Popes*? And yet if we may judge of *Popes* as *Bellarmino* doth of a Church, and that Heresie doth nullify their Elections and Successions as it doth the Verity of a Church, there is nothing more shattered. For if we look into the Catalogue of them, we shall find *Zepherinus* a Montanist, *Marcellinus* sacrificing to Idols, *Liberius* and *Felix* Arrians, *Anastasi* a Nestorian, *Honorius* a Monothelite, *John* 23. denying a future Life, with many others.

De Pontif. l. 4.
c. 14. §. Tri-
cesimus septi-
mus.

Go we on, and where shall we find more, or greater Schisms? one *Pope* cursing another, and undoing what his Predecessor had done, as was the Case of *Formosus*, *Romanus*, *Stephanus*, and *Sergius*. Often two *Popes* together contesting for the Chair (as it was for above forty Years at once) and at one time three *Popes* that had such pretences to the Papacy, that each had Learned Men for their Patrons, and it could not be easily judged which of them was the true and lawful *Pope*, as *Bellarmino* himself acknowledges.

But this belongs to Note five, of which more in its due place.

3. If we proceed to Order, either in Worship or Discipline, the Case is so notorious as to the several Formularies used heretofore in that Church, that it needs not to be insisted upon, and it's impossible for them to deny it.

Vid. Note first
and second.

4. Therefore I shall proceed to Doctrine, which indeed is the great Character by which a Church is to be discovered and tried. And here that I may not either intrench upon what has been said before concerning the Variation of the Church of *Rome* in this Point from the Scriptures, and Antiquity, or prevent what may further

further be said upon Note *Nine*. I shall compare the Church of *Rome* with it self, and if I can therein prove, that it is not now, what it hath been in many main Points; it will follow, that it has no pretence to this Note of *Duration*: for upon this Point of *Alteration* doth *Bellarmino* put the Issue.

De Not. l. 4.
c. 6. S. Quamvis autem.

What the Church of Rome doth hold.

What the Church of Rome hath held.

1. The Church of *Rome* is the Mother and Mistress of all Churches, and to believe her so to be, is necessary to Salvation. *Concil. Trid. Sess. 7. de Bapt. Can. 3.* & *Bulla Pii 4.*

1. Before the time of the *Nicene Council*, little regard was had to the Church of *Rome*. So Pope *Pius 2.* *Epist.* p. 802. And the Church of *Rome* call'd others Apostolical and Sister-Churches.

2. The Pope of *Rome* is Christ's Vicar, and hath the Supream Power over the whole Church, and without Subjection to him as such, is no Salvation. *Concil. Trid. Sess. 6. Decret. de Reform. c. 1.* & *Bulla Pii. 4.*

2. For one Bishop to set himself over the rest, and to have all the rest in Subjection to him, is the Pride of *Lucifer*, and the fore-running of Antichrist. Pope *Gregor. 1.* *Epist.* 36.

Apocrypha.

3. The Apocryphal Books are Canonical, and *Tobit* and *Judith*, &c. are as much the Holy Scripture as *Genesis*,

3. St. *Jerom.* (who was a Member of the Latin Church) saith, That tho *Tobias*, *Judith*, and *Macca-*
I bees,

nefis, &c. and whoſoever re-
jects theſe as not Canonical,
is accuſed. *Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 4.*

bees, &c. were read, yet
they were not received as
Canonical Scriptures. *Pro-
log. Proverb.* And Pope
Gregory 1. quoting the *Mac-
cabees*, excuſes himſelf for
producing a Teſtimony out
of a Book not Canonical.
We do not amiſs, &c. *Moral.
in Job, l. 19. c. 13.*

Scriptures and Tradition.

4. Scripture alone is not
a Rule of Faith without
Tradition; and Traditions
are to be received with the
like regard and Venerati-
on as the Scriptures. *Trid.
Seſſ. 4.*

4. Gregory 1. faith, *All
things which ediſe and in-
ſtruct, are contained in the
Scriptures; and that from
thence the Teachers may pre-
ſently teach whatſoever is
needful.* In *Ezek. Hom. l. 1.
c. 8. de Cur. Paſt. l. 2. c. 11.*

Scripture in unknown Tongues.

5. The Scripture are
not to be read in the vulgar
Tongue without Licence,
becauſe more Prejudice
than Profit will redound
from it. *Reg. Ind. Libr.
prohib. R. 4.*

5. Pope Gregory the 9th,
An. 1227. declared, *The not
knowing the Scriptures by the
Teſtimony of Truth it ſelf,
is the occaſion of Errours;
and therefore it's expedient
for all Men to read, or hear
them.* *Epift. ad Germ. Ar-
chiep. Conſtant. apud. M.
Paris. Hen. 3.*

Merit.

6. Good Works do truly deserve Eternal Life, and whoever holds the contrary, is Accursed. *Trid. Sess. 6. c. 16. & Can. 32.*

6. Gregory 1. saith, *That the best of Men will find no Merit in their best Actions; And that, If he should attain to the highest Vertue, he should obtain Eternal Life; not by Merits, but by Pardon.* Moral. l. 9. c. 11. And elsewhere he saith, *I pray to be Saved, not trusting to my Merits, but presuming to obtain that by thy Mercy alone, which I hope not for by my Merit.* In 1 Psal. poenit.

Indulgences.

7. By Indulgences granted by the Popes and Prelates of the Church, Persons are discharged from temporal Punishment here, and in Purgatory. *Trid. Sess. 25. Bull. Pii. 4.*

7. Fisher Bp. of Rochester in Hen. 8th's Time, saith, *The use of Indulgences seems to belate in the Church: and upon the recital of this Testimony, Polydore Virgil adds, which being things of so great moment, you might expect them more certainly from the Mouth of God.* De Invent. l. 8. c. 1. Cardinal Cajetan saith, *There is no Authority of Scripture, or ancient Fathers, Greek or Latin, that brings them to our Knowledge.* Opusc. 15. c. 1.

Purgatory.

8. There is a Purgatory after this Life, where the Souls of those that are not purged, nor have satisfied for their Sins here, are there to be Purged, and to give Satisfaction; unless their Time be shortned by the Prayers, Alms, and Masses of the Living. *Trid. Sess. 25. & Sess. 22. Can. 3.*

8. Bp. Fisher saith, *There is none, or very rare mention of Purgatory in the ancient Fathers.* Roff. contr. Luther, Art. 18. And Pope Gregory 1. saith, *That at the time of Death, either the good or evil Spirit seizeth upon the Soul, and keeps it for ever with it, without any Change.* Moral. in Job, l. 8. c. 8. Vid. *Vindication of the Answer to some late Papers*, pag. 76.

Service in an unknown Tongue.

9. It's required that Divine Service be performed in the *Latin* Tongue, and whosoever saith it ought to be Administred in a Vulgar Tongue, is Accursed.

9. Bellarmine acknowledges, That long after the Apostles both in the Eastern and Western Churches, the People were wont to answer in Divine Offices. *De Verb. l. 2. cap. 16. §. sed neque.* Vid. *Discourse concerning Celebration of Divine Service in an unknown Tongue*, p. 46, 47, 48.

10. In the Church of Rome they pray to Saints and

10. Irenaus Bp. of Lyons saith, *Throughout the whole World*

and Angels as their Intercessors. *Trid. Sess. 25. Catech. Rom. par. 4. c. 9.*

World the Church doth nothing by Invocations of Angels——but directeth her Prayers to God which hath made All, and calls upon the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ.

And it seems not to have been an Article of Faith in the Times of *Lombard* and *Scotus*, (as it is now) The one of which saith, *It's not incredible the Saints do hear what we say.* And the latter, *It's probable God doth reveal our Prayers.* *Lomb. Sent. lib. 4. Dist. 45. Scot. in 4. Dist. Q. 45.*

Images.

11. Images are not only to be placed in Temples, but also to be worshipped: as if the Persons thereby represented were present. *Trid. Sess. 25. Catech. Rom. par. 4. c. 6. n. 4.*

Sacraments.

12. There are Seven Sacraments truly and properly so; and whosoever saith there are more or fewer Instituted by Christ, is Accursed. *Trid. Sess. 7. Can. 1.*

11. Pope Gregory 1. after he hath allowed Images in Temples, for information of the Ignorant, doth Professedly forbid the Worship of them. *Lib. 7. Epist. 109. ad Serenum, & Registr. Epist. l. 9. Ep. 9. &c.*

12. *Cassander*, a Member of the Church of Rome, saith, *We shall not likely find any before Peter Lombard, (who lived about 1130) that did define the number of the Sacraments.* *Art. 13. §. de num. Sacr.* And particular-

Transubstantiation.

13. Bread and Wine after Consecration, are turn'd into the Substance of Christ's Body and Blood, without changing the Species. *Cont. Trid.*

Communion in one kind.

14. The People are forbidden to receive the Sacrament in both kinds. *Trid. Sess. 21. c. 1.*

Solitary Masses.

15. Solitary Masses, where-

ly *Alex. Hales*, the famous Schoolman saith, That Confirmation was Ordained to be a Sacrament by the *Meldenian Council. Par. 4. Q. 9. M. 1.*

13. Pope *Gelasius* saith, That in the Sacrament the Substance or Nature of Bread ceaseth not, or Perisheth not. *Gelas. cont. Eutyech.*

Gregory 1. saith, That our Bodies as well as our Souls, are nourished by the Eucharist. *Sacram. 16. Kal. Mar. & in 6. Psal. pœnit.*

14. Pope *Gelasius* declares, Either let them receive the whole Sacrament, or let them be driven from the whole: for the dividing of one and the same Sacrament, cannot be done without great Sacriledg. *De Consecr. Dist. 2. Comperimus.*

And Pope *Gregory 1.* affirms it to be the constant practice for the People to receive in both kinds. *Sacram. in Quadrag. Tr. 3. Vid. Vindication of the Answer to some Papers. p. 75.*

15. *Anacletus* Bishop of Rome

wherein the Priest Communicates alone, are approved and commended ; and whosoever faith they are unlawful and to be abrogated, is Accursed. *Trid. Sess. 22. Can. 8.*

Auricular Confession.

16. Without particular Confession of Sins to a Priest, is neither Forgiveness, nor Salvation to be obtained. *Trid. Sess. 14. c. 5. Can. 6, 7.*

Extreme Unction.

17. Extreme Unction is a Sacrament, and to be Administred, when Persons are in imminent Danger ; and last of all to be applied. *Trid. Sess. 14. c. 13.*

Priests Marriage.

18. Those that are in Orders, may not Marry ; and those that are Married, may not be admitted to Orders. *Conc. Later. 1. Can. 21. & Later. 2. Can. 6.*

Rome did Decree, That all present should Communicate, or else should be turn'd out of the Church, for so the Apostles did order, and the Holy Church of *Rome* observeth. *Par. 3. Dist. 1. Episcop. & 2. peracta.*

Gregory 1. forbids the Priest to celebrate the Eucharist alone. *Greg. lib. Capital. cap. 7: apud Cassand. Liturg. c. 33.*

16. This was neither in the Time of Pope *Gelasius*, or Pope *Gregory 1.* *Vid. Vindication of the Answer. p. 73.*

17. In *Gregory* the Firſt's Time, it was used in order to Recovery, and the Eucharist was to be given after it. *Sacram. p. 253. Vid. Vindicat. of the Answ. p. 77.*

18. To Marry was a priviledg belonging to the Clergy as well as others. So *Cassander Consult. Art. 23, & Polyd. Virg. Invent. l. 5. c. 4.*

By this Parallel thus, far drawn betwixt the Ancient and Present Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, we may be able to judg of the Immutability and Duration of the Church ; which can no more be Consistent with it, than one part of a Contradiction can be reconciled to another ; or than Infallibility , can be consistent with the having Actually Err'd. To find Fallible Churches mistaken, and at some times to vary from themselves, is consistent with their Nature, and for all which, (if the Errors are not Fundamental,) they are Churches still ; but to find Errors and Contradictions in an Infallible Church, is to confound the Nature of Things, to give the Infallible Church no advantage over the Fallible ; and to expose the Persons that betake themselves to that shelter, to all the Disquietudes, Uncertainties, and Disappointments of Ignorance, and Error. For, what is the usual Reason given for forsaking other Churches, but because they are Fallible? What is the Reason why they go over to the Church of *Rome*, but because she is, (as they are made to believe) Infallible ? But if with her Infallibility she has mistaken ; if with her Certainty she contradicts her self ; if she was one thing in one Age, and another in another ; then there is the same Reason to quit the Church of *Rome*, as there was to imbrace it ; and such persons must either be contented with a Church that is Fallible, or be of none.

T H E E N D.

L O N D O N,

Printed by J. D. for Richard Chiswel at the Rose and Crown in
St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1687.

The Fourth Note of the CHURCH EXAMINED,

VIZ

AMPLITUDE, or Multitude and Variety of Believers.

Quarta Nota est Amplitudo, five Multitudo & Varietas Credentium.
Bellarm. L. iv. c. vii. de Notis Ecclesiæ.

I M P R I M A T U R,

Apr. 27. 1687.

GUIL. NEEDHAM.

WE could very willingly appeal to our Adversaries themselves, were they unconcerned, whether a plainer Proof can be given of a Baffled Cause in a Controversy relating to any Point of revealed Religion, than for the Assertors of it to decline maintaining it by those Books, which alone can acquaint us with Divine Revelations. But 'tis Notorious, that the *Romanists* are highly chargeable upon this Account, in their Endeavours to persuade the World, That *theirs* is the only True Church. They need not be told, that we are beholden to the *Holy Scriptures* for our having any Notion of such a thing as a Church; and they, and we are agreed, That, *that* only is the True *Christian Church*, which professeth the True *Christi-*

an Faith: and therefore how is it possible they should not be aware, that the best way to be satisfied whether those, who challenge to themselves the Title of, the *True and Catholick Church*, have it really belonging to them, is, to examine their Faith by the Holy Scriptures? Which 'tis hard to imagine they can think to be *so imperfect a Rule* of Faith, as to believe it a justifiable thing to be so averse to this Method, as we have ever found they are. This we of the *Reformation* have always stuck to, and we are desirous of nothing more, than that it may be tried by the Faith we profess, whether we are found Members of the Catholick Church, and the soundness of our Faith may be tried by the Scriptures.

But instead of taking this Course, those of the *Roman Communion* have invented and do insist on a Company of Notes and Characters of the Church, which are either not to be met with, or are far from being plainly delivered, in Scripture. Had this been *our Practice*, I appeal to their own Consciences, whether they could have imputed it to a better Cause, than our being conscious to our selves of the disagreeableness of our Faith with the Doctrine of Scripture, and our not daring to have it brought to this Touch-stone.

Of this sort of Notes Cardinal *Bellarmino* hath given us no fewer than *Fifteen*, among which he could afford no Place to this Note of ours; though 'tis as evident as the Light, that this one alone would have signified much more to his Purpose, than all *that long Bead-roul* put together.

The Design of this Discourse is to examine his *Fourth Note*, viz. *Amplitudo, sive Multitudo & Varietas Credientium*. *Amplitude, or Multitude and Variety of Believers*. And how far he makes it to extend, his next Words inform us, viz. *Ecclesia enim verè Catholica, non solum*

solum debet amplecti omnia Tempora, sed etiam omnia Loca, omnes Nationes, omnia Hominum Genera. The truly Catholick Church, ought not only to comprehend all Ages, but also all Places, all Nations, and all sorts of Men. And,

First, He endeavours to prove this to be a True Note.

Secondly, To make it to belong to the Church of Rome, and to her alone.

Thirdly, To persuade us, That those particularly who call themselves the Reformed Churches, can lay no claim to it.

And it shall be my Business,

First, To shew, That this cannot be a Note of the True Church. And,

Secondly, Supposing it to be so, That the Church of Rome will however gain nothing by it, as to her Pretension; nor the Reformed Churches lose any thing: Nay, on the contrary, that it will quite overthrow her Pretension of being the whole Catholick Church, and do the Reformed Churches as great Service, as Her Prejudice.

First, I will briefly shew, That this cannot be a Note of the True Church. By a Note is understood, A distinguishing Character; but this is such a Character of the True Church as no one could less distinguish it: And that, whether we consider the Members thereof under, either the notion of a great Multitude, or a great Multitude of Believers.

Considering them under the Notion of a great Multitude; the Church which is *Christ's* Kingdom, is far from being distinguishable as *such* from the Kingdom of *Satan*, which was always incomparably more numerous:

Or from that part of it which consisteth of *Idolatrous Pagans*. What *Romanist* can boast of his Church, in reference to this Note, as *Demetrius the Silver-Smith* did of his *Diana*, when he said, *That all Asia and the World worshipped her*? Nor can the Church of *Christ* by the Number of its Members, be distinguished from the Worshippers of that great Impostor *Mahomet*; which the Sons of the *Roman Church* must especially grant to be far exceeding the Members of *Christ's True Church* in Number, since they make *themselves* the only Catholics.

Again, considering them under the Notion of a great Multitude of *Believers*, There was an Age in which the *Orthodox Christians* could not be distinguished from *Hereticks*, by the greatness of their Number (whom the *Romanists* will not admit to be Members of the Church in any sense) for in the Reign of *Arrianism*, *Ingenuit Orbis & mirabatur, &c.* The World lamented, and wondred to find it self turned *Arrian*; saith *St. Hierom.* And it became a Proverb, *Athanasius against the whole World: and the whole World against Athanasius.* And lastly, The Church of *Christ* is not to be thus distinguished from the Kingdom of *Antichrist*. I wish our Adversaries could impartially consider, whose Note that of *having Power given him over all Kindreds, and Tongues, and Nations* is most likely to be: And who it is, that is described by *sitting, as upon seven Hills, so upon many Waters*: Which Waters are *Peoples, and Multitudes, and Nations, and Tongues.*

These things considered, nothing is more apparent, than that the *True Church* is neither to be distinguished from other Bodies of Men, or of Professors of Christianity, by the largeness of its Extent, or the Numerousness of its Members: and therefore that a *True Note* there-

Apoc. 13. 7.

Chap. 17. 1.

Ver. 15.

thereof cannot result from these. And besides, a True Note of the Church must be Essential to it, must belong thereto *as* the True Church; and therefore is inseparable from it. But how could Amplitude, or Multitude, be ascribed to the True Church in the Time of our Saviour, when he called it, *A little Flock*, and said, *Strait is the Gate, and narrow is the Way that leadeth unto Life, and few there be that find it, &c.*

But Bellarmine pretends to fetch this Note of his, out of the Bible; and not only to be beholden to *Vincensius Lyrinensis* for it, whom he first cites in favour of it: tho little to his Purpose as will be seen anon. The Texts he produces are *Four*; *two* in the Old Testament, and *two* in the New. Those in the Old Testament are, *Psal. 2. 8.* Where God the Father promiseth his Son, That *He will give him the Heathen for his Inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the Earth for his Possession.* And *Psal. 72. 8.* Where 'tis prophesied, That *Christ shall have Dominion from Sea to Sea, and from the River unto the Ends of the Earth.* Those in the New Testament are, *Luk. 24. 47.* Where our Lord declareth, That *Repentance and Remission of Sins should be preached in his Name among all Nations, beginning at Jerusalem.* And *Acts 1. 8.* Where he tells his Apostles, That *they shall receive Power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon them, and they shall be Witnesses unto him, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the Earth.* And it cannot be doubted, but that these Texts do prove, That the Members of Christ's Church shall be a very vast Multitude, and that its Amplitude, should even extend over all the World. But nevertheless,

1. It doth not from hence follow, That the Conjunction of Amplitude and Multitude doth make a Note;

or distinguishing Character, of Christ's True Church. It is *one* thing to say, it belongs thereto as an Attribute; and *another*, that 'tis appropriated to it as a Note. That may be even Essential to a Thing, which yet is not a Note of Distinction, or peculiar Property, whereby it may be known from all *other* Things. The power of Sensation is Essential to a Man; yet for all that, he is not distinguishable thereby from a Beast. But it is evident from what hath been discoursed, That the true Church is not to be distinguish'd from the Kingdom of *Satan*, nor of *Antichrist*, nor from *Erroneous Sects*, by Amplitude and Multitude: And that these together, or apart, are not so much as Essential to the Church of Christ; since there was a time when, as hath been said, it was without them both.

2. This is so far from being a Note of the Church, that 'tis no more than a variable State and Condition thereof; since it hath had, from time to time, its Ebbs and Flows, and hath had sometimes larger, and other times straiter and narrower Bounds. This the *Cardinal* was aware of, and therefore, among other things he would have to be observed for the right understanding of this his Note, he saith, That, *Although the Church ought not necessarily to be in all places at the same time, yet now it ought necessarily to be, or to have been, in the greater part of the World: For 'tis acknowledged by all, even the Hereticks themselves* (meaning the Protestants) *that the Church is now in her old Age, and therefore must be past growing.* By the way; though all his Hereticks, no doubt, do believe, that the Church hath daily grown elder and elder; yet I know not how many he hath found asserting, that she is now arrived at old Age. But it will by no means be granted him, That the Church is yet grown so old, as to be past growing; or to have a
peri-

period put to its time of Encreasing. And therefore I add,

3. That we have great assurance that the Church hitherto hath not deserved to be compared with what it shall be before the end of the World, both in respect of its Amplitude, and the number of Believers. For there are very many plain Prophecies from whence this may certainly be concluded; which all, that without prejudice consider them, must needs be satisfied, have not hitherto been accomplish'd; Namely, those which have reference to the *Calling of the Jews*, and the *bringing in of the fulness of the Gentiles*, and the *most plentiful Effusion of the Spirit*, and *perfect rest from Persecution*, and *universal Peace*, with the most wonderful outward Prosperity of the Church. There are, I say, abundance of the plainest Predictions and Promises of this Nature, which the Church hath not as yet experimented the performance of; and they are expressed in such Words as that it may reasonably be believed, that those great things which God hath heretofore done for his Church, either *Jewish* or *Christian*, are no better than Types and Emblems of what he intends to do, in his appointed Time. Among those Predictions and Promises, the Reader may consult these following, which are but a few in comparison of the whole Number, *viz.* in the Old Testament, *Psal.* 22. 27, to 31. *Isa.* 2. 1, to 6. *Chap.* 11. *throughout*. *Jer.* 32. 37, to 43. *Chap.* 33. 7, to the end. *Dan.* 7. 13, 14. And in the New Testament, *Mat.* 24. 14. *Rom.* 11. 12. and *ver.* 25, to 33. *2 Cor.* 3. 15, 16. *Apoc.* 20. 1, to 7. Though the fulfilling of these Scriptures hath been deferred for so many Ages, yet He is *Faithful that hath promised* so glorious an Encrease of his Church, with the other unspeakable Blessings now mentioned, and will fulfil them when the Time is come which

which his infinite Wisdom knows to be the fittest for that Purpose.

And thus much may suffice to be said, in reference to the Cardinal's proving this Note by *Scripture*.

As to those Words, in the next place, of *Vincensius Lyrinensis*, in his *Commonitorium*, which he produceth for the Confirming thereof, *viz. Eos propriè esse Catholicos, qui tenent id quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus creditum est.* Those are properly Catholics, who hold that which hath been always, every where, and by all believed. I Answer,

1. That *Vincensius* doth not pretend to give us, in these Words, a Note of the Catholick Church, but of such a *Christian*. This is evident at first sight: And so is this.

2. Whereas he makes it the Character of a true Catholick, to hold what hath been believed *semper, ubique ab omnibus*, it cannot be hence inferred, that he believed Amplitude, or a Multitude of Believers, to be so much as an Attribute of the Catholick Church; and therefore much less a Note.

3. If these Words lay down a true Note of a Catholick Christian, then no Body of Christians can be more evidently proved to be no true Catholics, than those of the *Roman* Communion may, in all those Articles of Faith which are peculiar to themselves. For, as to Points of mere Belief, how much more than the *Apostles Creed* can they shew us to have been received, *always, every where, and by all Christians*? But as for that large Addition of *Tridentine* Articles, annexed to that Creed by *P. Pius* the 4th. No unbiaſſed Person can believe, they have ever done any thing *like* proving, that any of them have been received *always*, and much less *every where*, and by all those whom themselves own for *Catholick Christians*.

4. By

4. By this Note of a Catholick, no Society of Christians can bid so fair for Catholicism, as the Reformed Churches, but especially the Church of *England*; whose avowed Principle it is, *to receive nothing as an Article of Faith, but what is contained in the Holy Scriptures, or may be proved thereby.* Nor doth she embrace any one Doctrine as an *Article of Faith*, but what is clearly expressed in those Books, of whose Canonicalness there never was the least Dispute in the Primitive Church. Artic. 6.

Secondly. I proceed to shew that if we should acknowledge this to be a true Note of the Catholick Church; instead of enabling the Church of *Rome*, to make good her Pretension of so being, it will destroy it: And instead of doing Disservice to the Reformed Churches, it will do them excellent Service, and be a certain Argument of their being true Parts of the Catholick Church. And,

1. I will shew that it will not at all Advantage the Church of *Rome* as to that her Pretension, and therefore can do us no Prejudice. The Cardinal proves,

(1.) *That his Church began to fructify throughout the World in the Days of the Apostles*, from these Words of *St. Paul*, Col. 1. 6. *The Truth of the Gospel is come unto you, as it is in all the World, and bringeth forth Fruit, as it doth also in you, &c.* But what is this to *his Church*? Is the Gospel's bringing forth Fruit in all the World, the same thing with the Church of *Rome's* so doing?

(2.) He adds the Authority of several *Fathers*, for this Church's being spread in *their* Time, all over the then known World, but gives us none of their Sayings except *St. Prosper's*. The first Father he cites is *St. Irenaeus*, in the 3d Chapter of his Book. But the Father here only saith, *That this Faith* (which he sums up immediately before, and is but the chief part of the

Edit. *Paris*.
P. 53.

Apostles Creed) the Church disseminated throughout the World diligently preserves, as if it were confined but to one House. But how doth this concern the Church of Rome? Which is not once mentioned with others here particularly named; except we could be made to believe that wheresoever the word Church is found, that Church is still to be understood. Next he cites *Tertullian adversus Judæos*, and having search'd that Book, these, or none, are the Words he means, viz. *Those Words of David are to be understood of the Apostles, Their Sound is gone forth in all the Earth, and their Words unto the End of the World: For in whom have all Nations believed, but in Christ, who is now come? The Parthians, Medes, Elamites, and those that inhabit Mesopotamia, Armenia, Phrygia, Cappadocia, Pontus, Asia and Pamphilia, Egypt, Africa, and beyond Cyrene, the Romans and Jews now in Jerusalem, and other Nations; as now of the Getuli and Moors, all Spain, divers Countries of the Gauls, and those of the Britains, which the Romans could never conquer, are subject to Christ, &c.* But I again ask, What is all this to the Church of Rome, more than to any other particular Church belonging to any one of the many Nations, of which that of the Romans is one, and two whole Quarters of the World, here mentioned? His third Father is St. Cyprian, in his Book *de Unitate Ecclesie*. But here is nothing he could fancy to be for his Purpose, except these Words: *The Church is one, which by its Fruitfulness is extended into a Multitude; As there are many Rays of the Sun, and but one Light, &c. So the Church of our Lord, which being filled with Light, sends forth her Beams through the whole World, is but one Light, which is diffused every-where.* But though this be said of the Catholick Church; is here the least Intimation that the Church of Rome is this Catholick Church? After

St.

Edit. Rig. p.
180.

Edit. Oxon.
p. 108.

St. *Cyprian* follow several of the *later Fathers*, their Books being only directed to. But the narrow room I am confined to, will not permit me to examine them; nor need we look any farther to be satisfied, how this greatest Man of the *Roman Church* condescended to the most shameful Impertinence, in citing Scripture and Fathers for the doing her Service. But we must not overlook St. *Prosper's* Verses, in his Book *de Ingratis*, viz.

*Sedes Roma Petri, quæ Pastoralis Honoris
Facta Caput Mundo, quicquid non possidet Armis,
Religione tenet* ————— i. e.

Rome the Seat of Peter, being made the Head of Pastoral Honour in the World, whatsoever Country she possesseth not by her Arms, she holds by her Religion.

But, considering how early this Father liv'd, viz. about the beginning of the *Fifth Century*, he could mean no more than *this*, That the Church of *Rome*, the most Honourable of all other (by means of that Cities being the antient Seat of the Emperors) keeps still Possession of those Places by the Religion they received from Her, over which she hath lost Her Old Dominion. And what is this, but *another* plain Instance, of most idle quoting of Ancient Authors? Not to reflect upon *Fetching Arguments from Poetical Flourishes*.

But, not to stand to consider how Ample the *Roman Church* was in the Times of those Fathers, nothing is more evident, than that *that* part of Christendom she took up, was but a small Spot of Ground compared with the Space *those Churches* filled; which, tho they held Communion with Her, were *distinct Churches* from Her, and owned no Subjection to Her. And it was about,

or above, an *Hundred Years* after the *youngest* of those Fathers, that the Pope was invested by that Execrable Wretch *Phocas* (a Blessed Title in the mean time) with the Primacy over all Churches. And *Gregory the Great*, who died in the Beginning of the *Sixth Century*, not only sharply inveighed against *John* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, and his Successor *Cyriacus*, for assuming to themselves the Title of *Universal Bishops* (though there was no appearance of their designing any thing more thereby, than an Addition of *Honour* (not of *Power*) to that Patriarchate) but also called those who should affect such a Haughty Title, the *Fore-runners of Antichrist*. And, as these Bishops taking this Title, was a Demonstration, that they acknowledged not the least Subjection to the Bishops of *Rome*; so Pope *Gregory's* calling those Bishops who should so do, without Exception, *Forerunners of Antichrist*, is as plain a Proof, that the Bishops of *Rome* to *his* Time, did not look on themselves as having a Primacy over all Churches. And 'tis manifest that in the Time of the Council of *Nice*, the Church of *Rome* was not thought to include the Catholick Church, or to be any more than one part thereof: This, I say, is manifest from the *Sixth Canon* of that Council, viz. *Let the ancient Customs be preserved, for the Bishop of Alexandria to have Jurisdiction over Egypt, Lybia and Pentapolis; because the Bishop of Rome hath a like Custom, &c.* Which is as much as to say, that the Bishop of *Alexandria* had then the same uncontrollable Power in his large Jurisdiction, that the Bishop of *Rome* had in *his*. And therefore that Council knew nothing of this Bishop's having any Power over the *Alexandrian*, and much less over the *whole Catholick Church*. Nor is any thing more certain, than that the mere Superiority of *Honour*, which the *Roman Church* had, was founded on no Divine Right,

Greg. Epist.
37. & 70. lib.
11. & Ep. 30.
lib. 4.

Right, but only on *that Cities* being the Seat of the Empire. For, as the *Second General Council*, viz. that of *Constantinople*, decreed in its *Third Canon*, That the Bishop of *Constantinople* should have the priviledg of Honour *next* to the Bishop of *Rome*; upon the account of its being the Imperial City, and therefore called *New Rome*: So in the *Twenty eighth Canon* of the *Fourth General Council*, viz. that of *Chalcedon*, it was ordained, that for the *same Reason*, the Bishop of *Constantinople* should have *equal* priviledges with the Bishop of *Rome*. So that 'tis a plain Case, that whosoever shall undertake to prove from any Sayings of the Ancients, for the first 500 Years at least, that the Church of *Rome* and the *Catholick Church* were reputed to be the *same*, and consequently that whatsoever they said of the Amplitude of *this* is to be understood of *that Church*, must necessarily make as sad work of it, as *Bellarmin* hath here done. And therefore it is apparent too, that no Service can be done to the Church of *Rome* by this *Note*, as to her pretension of being the true, *Catholick Church*: From whence it will likewise follow, that no *Prejudice* can from thence accrue to the *Reformed Churches*. But this is not all; For,

2. This *Note*, were it a true one, would be *Descriptive* to that her Pretence, and do the *Reformed Churches* great *Service*, viz. in demonstrating them to be true parts of the *Catholick Church*. *This* also may be concluded from what hath been said, but it will be made *more* evident by these following Considerations.

1. If the Church of *Rome* had as Ample a Spread over the World, for some of the first Ages, as *Bellarmin* contends for, *this* would far more redound to the Advantage of our Churches of the Reformation (were *Amplitude* a distinguishing Property of the Church) than to the Ad-

Advantage of the present Church of *Rome*, because that Church *then* was more *ours*, than now it is the *Romanists*. For there can scarcely be a greater Disagreement in *Doctrine* and *Worship* between any two *Christian* Churches, than there hath for a long time been between the *same* Church as she was *then*, and is *now*. But the Agreement is as great between the Ancient Church of *Rome*, and *our* Churches; and especially between Her and the Church of *England*. This our Adversaries could not but see, would they impartially compare the *Doctrine* and *Worship* of each together. And the only Quarrel they have with us, is, that we will not admit more into *our Creed*, than the Christians of the First Ages did into *theirs*: And that we worship God only by the alone Mediation of Jesus Christ, as *they* did: That our Laity partake of the Communion in both kinds, as *theirs* did. And, in short, that we believe the Holy Scripture to be a compleat Rule of Faith, as it was every where believed to be by the Primitive Catholicks; and that we will not receive into our Worship the *Roman* Novelties; those things which were utterly unknown to both the *Roman* and all *other* Churches in *those* Ages.

Now, whereas the *Cardinal* would have it observed, for the better explaining the meaning of this Note, *That if one Province alone should retain the true Faith, it might properly be called the Catholick Church, so long as its Faith is one and the same, with that which at one time or other had prevailed in the whole World*: We desire no greater Advantage to *our* Church, and all other in Communion with Her; since *these* and *those* Churches which in the Primitive Times were extended all over the then known Parts of the World, are agreed in much more than all the Fundamental Points of Faith.

2. It hath been estimated upon Computation, that the Churches subject to the *Roman See* exceed not much the Reformed Churches in Amplitude, or Multitude of Members : Especially since *Italy, Spain, and Portugal* are detained in the *Romish* Religion, nor by Choice or Judgment, but by Ignorance and the Tyranny of the Inquisition. But who can be Ignorant that the Church of *Rome* bears not the least proportion upon those Accounts, with these Churches considered in *Conjunction* with that part of Christendom which agreeth with them, as in all the main Points of Christianity, so in refusing Subjection to *that* Church ; and in most of those Doctrines and Practices, which we condemn in Her as contrary to Holy Scripture, or as not founded thereon (and yet made necessary to Salvation by Her) and not taught by the Primitive Church ? So that should all the Churches which deny that of *Rome* to have any Authority over them, deal with Her as she hath dealt with Them, and pronounce Her to have nothing more left Her than the mere *Name* of a Church : This Her Note would be an unanswerable Objection against Her being *A True Church*, as well as *The True Church* ; on supposition that (as she holds) of two Parties of Christians rejecting Communion with, and unchurching each other, but one of them can be a *True Church*. That so large a part of Christendom, I say, agrees with the Reformed Churches in all the Grand Articles of Faith, and in the Chief of those wherein they are at Variance with the Church of *Rome*, as makes the whole an incomparably greater Body of Believers than all those *together* who own that Church for their Mother, is so notorious, that 'tis impossible our Adversaries should dispute it.

The *Cardinal* indeed tells us, on this Note, That *Besides all Italy and Spain, and almost all France, which the Church*

See the Preface
to Ererewood's
Enquiries.

Church of Rome possesseth: And besides Germany, England, Poland, Bohemia, Hungary, Greece, Syria, Æthiopia, Egypt, in which many Catholicks are found; even in the New World (viz. America) She hath Churches without the mixture of Hereticks. And we can Reply, That Besides, England, Scotland and Ireland, in which Protestantism is the National Religion: and in the two former of which, the Number of Papists is very considerable: And besides Denmark, Norway, Sweden and the United Provinces, in all which 'tis also the National Religion: And besides Germany, Switzerland, Hungary, Transilvania, in which are abundance of Protestant Churches, (as there were lately in the Kingdom of France too, and 'twill never be forgot by what Methods they have been extirpated); Besides all those Countries, I say, the Protestants have also their Churches in the New World, no less without the mixture of Hereticks: And these consist of other kind of Believers than those the Romanists boast of in that Quarter. For, whereas Surinus and others have told prodigious Stories of incredible Numbers of them, that have been baptized by particular Priests; Acoſta, tho a Jesuit, acknowledgeth that

Many of them were driven to Baptism as Beasts to the Water. And Oviedo saith of Cuba, That there was scarcely any one, or but excremely few, that willingly became Christians. And both he and Benzo, who were long conversant in those parts, say of Cuba and New Spain, That they had scarcely any thing belonging to Christianity, besides the bare Name of Christians. That they only minded the Name they received in Baptism, and not long after forgot that too. And the former of these makes this no matter of Wonder, since he declares their Converters to be no better Christians than these Converts: And excellently expostulates with them about the horrible Wickedness of their

DeProcur.Ind.

Sal. l. 6. c. 3.

Ovied. Hist.

Ind. Occid. l.

1. c. 4.

Benzo Hist.

Nov. Orb. l. 2.

c. 19.

their Lives; telling them that would they give the poor *Indians* good Examples, this Method would signify much more towards the making of them good Christians, than that Course they took with them. And the old Monsieur *Arnaud*, in an Assembly at *Paris*, scoffed at the *Jesuits* for the Conversion of the *Indians*; calling it a brave warlike Conversion, *Conversionem bellam & bellicosam*; and telling them that they had converted *Gladium oris in os Gladii*.

And whereas the *Cardinal*, in the Words following those last cited, makes this Flourish, *That Rome hath Churches in all the four Parts of the World; to the East in the Indies, to the West in America, to the North in Japan, to the South in Brasil, and the uttermost Part of Africa*: If his meaning was more than *this*, That there is no Country in all those Parts, but what hath *Romanists* in it, it was (to say no worse) a mere Flourish: If he meant *no more* than so, we may dare to affirm as much concerning Protestants. But it matters not much whether we can or no, since there are infinite Numbers of Christians, who, though they bear not the Name of *Protestants*, yet agree with them in not being *Papists*, and (as was said) in all the great Points of the Christian Religion, whether of Faith or Practice.

To pass by the Christians under the Patriarch of *Mozall*, of whom *Postellus* saith, *Though they are but few in comparison of what they have been, yet they are many more than us Latines*. To say nothing neither of the *Armenian* Christians, falsely called *Nestorians* (whose *Catholick*, as they call their Patriarch,

Cosmog. p. 69.

See Brere-
wood's En-
quiries, p. 211.
last Edit.

arch, *Otho Frisingensis* reports to have under his Obedience above a *Thousand* Bishops, from the Report of his Legats sent to *Rome*) both which vast Bodies of Christians acknowledg no Subjection to the See of *Rome*: I say, to pass by *these*, we need not instance in *any* besides the *Greek Church*, for the foresaid Purpose: Which hath had an uninterrupted Succession of Bishops from the Apostles, and is of greater Antiquity than the Church of *Rome*, and which hath produced *more Fathers* than *that Church*. This Church is divided into many Nations, as the *Hyberians*, the People of *Colchis* (now *Mengrelia*) the *Arabians*, *Chaldeans*, *Ethiopians*, *Egyptians*, *Moscovites*, *Bulgarians*, *Sclavonians*, *Albanians*, *Caramanians*, *Walachians*, *Moldavians*, *Gracians*, &c. And we may guess what a huge Disproportion there is in Largeness, between all the *Greek Churches*, and those Subject to the Church of *Rome*, by *this*, That the Countries in *Europe* and *Asia*, which the *Moscovites* alone inhabit, are computed to be near of as great an extent as *all Europe* besides.

The *Greek Church* hath *Four Ancient Patriarchs*, the *Constantinopolitan*, the *Alexandrian*, the *Antiochian*, and the Patriarch of *Jerusalem*. And since the Patriarchate of *Constantinople* hath been under the *Turkish Tyranny*, there hath been a *Fifth Patriarch*, *viz.* of *Mosco*. *Cyril* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, and since of *Constantinople*, *Bellarmin's* Contemporary, faith of the *Greek Church* dispersed through the foresaid Nations, that *They are stedfast in the Faith of Christ*: That no Innovation in Matters of Faith is found among them; and but only some difference in Ceremonies. He acknowledgeth that some of those Nations are

Ep. 2. ad Vy-
tenbogard.
inter Ep. praef.
Vir. p. 399. in
Ottavo.

are not free from Superstition ; but adds, That *without detriment of the Faith it is connived at, because it can't be remedied, in regard of many Difficulties : But in those things which belong to the Essence of Faith, Perseverantes sunt & permanentes, they are fixed and unalterable.* He also writes, that *Whereas the Oriental Churches seem to be Reproached for their Ignorance ; Philosophy and other sorts of Learning being gone from thence into other Parts, since they have been oppressed with many Miseries by reason of the Tyranny of the Turk, yet they reap no small Advantage hereby ; because by this Means they are unacquainted with those Pestiferous Questions, which at this time infect Mens Ears ; and with the new Moustrous Portentous Doctrines : And 'tis plain what Doctrines he chiefly meant.* He adds, that *They are content with incompta Fides, a plain undrest Faith, taught them by the Apostles and their Ancestors, and herein they persevere even unto Blood : That They keep ὁρθόδοξον integram, the Faith entirely : That They see themselves bereft of all their Substance, their Children snatch'd from their Embraces ; and are continually brought into the greatest Tribulations, yet it is not grievous to them to suffer these things for the Faith of Christ, &c.*

Ep. 1. ad euz-
dem. ibid.
p. 369.

See the Rnd.
Dean Scilling-
fleet's Defence
of the Greek
Church from the
Romanists
charge of Heresy.
In his Learned
Vindication of
Arch-Bishop
Laud.

So that the *Motto* which *Minutius Felix* made for the Primitive Christians, *Non magna Loquimur sed Vivimus ;* Great Things are not so much Talk'd as Lived by us : This Great Prelate (whose Fidelity in this Account is unquestionable, he being a Person of as fam'd Piety as Learning) doth assure us is deserved by these *Greek* Christians. But for all this, They must all be doom'd to Hell Torments, as effectually as the Church of *Rome's* Sentence can do it, because

The Fifth Note of the CHURCH EXAMINED,

VIZ,

The Succession of Bishops.

Quinta Nota est Successio Episcoporum in Romanâ Ecclesiâ ab Apostolis deducta usq; ad nos. Bellar. L. iv. c. viii. de Notis Ecclesiæ.

I M P R I M A T U R.

May 9. 1687.

JO. BATTELY.

THE Disputers of the Roman Communion boasting in nothing so much as in the venerable Name of the Catholick Church, using all means to appropriate it to themselves, exclusively to any others: And it being the most popular Argument they flee to, and with which they commonly begin and end all Debates: We are concerned faithfully and plainly to examine their Title or Claim to so honourable a Denomination, and the many vast Privileges founded thereupon.

Among the *Notes* of the Church in *Bellarmin* (their chief Champion) the *Fifth* in order, and it may be not the least Plausible in all his Number, is this of the *Succession of Bishops*, the Subject of this short Essay; in which three Inquiries may be made.

N

I. *How*

1. *How far this Note may be necessary to any Church?*
2. *How far this may be granted to the Roman Church?*
3. *How insufficient a Proof it affords to them of any great Advantage by it?*

Inquiry, 1. In answer to the former, it may I presume be general-
Concess. 1. ly yielded : That to the compleat Constitution of the Church, it will be always needful that there be in it *True and Lawful Pastors*, not only for the rightful Administration of God's Word and Sacraments, but also for the due and orderly Government thereof, and the Dispensation of wholsom Discipline to the Flock committed to their charge : requiring all tender Care, vigilant Inspection, and indulgent Provision from *Them* : And all cheerful and humble Submission, and ready Subjection from *These*. Requisites to any Society, confirmed by many Precepts and Examples in Scripture.

Concess. 2. We yield this *Pastoral Power originally to be from Christ*, the Head of his Church, the chief Bishop and Pastor of his Flock, and by him immediately conveyed to the Apostles, and from them derived by Imposition of Hands, or Ordination to their Successors in the several Churches which they planted, and so to be continued by a Regular Succession to the End of the World : As may be proved by the several Directions in the Epistles to *Timothy* and *Titus*, and Examples in the *Acts* of the *Apostles*, and the following Practice of the Church in all Ages, and Places, of which we have any Records extant : *No Man taketh this Honour to himself.*

Heb. 5. 4.

Concess. 3. We grant farther, that according to the best Evidence of Scripture-Rule or Example, and the constant Practice of Christ's Church, the *Power of Ordination* is entrusted with the Bishops, the chief Governours thereof, and ordi-

ordinary Successors of the Apostles unto the End of the World. And we as readily embrace the Canonical Provision of the *Constitutions* under the name of the Apostles by St. *Clemens*, or the Decree of the ever-renowned *first Council of Nice*, That every Bishop be ordained by three Bishops, or two at the least, &c.

All most agreeable to the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of *England*. Such is our Government and Succession not at all interrupted in the Reformation, whatever Difficulties it struggled with elsewhere. A signal Happiness, for which we have Reason ever to bless God, and not peevishly to endeavour, by wilful & schismatical Separations, to deprive our selves of that Privilege, which may be the chief Eye-sore to our Adversaries, and thereby to furnish them with new and better Arguments than ever yet they found against us. If their Succession be good, so is ours; (for sure it is not tyed to one place) whether we derive it through them by *Augustin the Monk*, though ordained in *France*, or from, or by the *British Bishops*, who had been here several Ages before his Coming, and by as Regular a Succession from Apostolical Times without any dependance, as they profess, or as far as we can find, on the *See or Bishop of Rome*.

However it may be noted, that though this Succession *Observ. 1.* of Bishops be necessary to the compleat Constitution of the Church; yet it may well be doubted whether it is indispensable to the very Being of it, so as to unchurch every Place that wants these. For Baptism alone gives us Admission into the Church, and a Title to the Heavenly Inheritance upon the Performance of our Part of the Covenant. And although this obliges all Christians to endeavour to provide themselves with lawful Pastors for their constant Supply in all the means of Grace, and

so to seek them abroad, as far as they can, where they have them not at home. Yet, in a supposed case, where these may not be had, or but upon conditions out of their Power to yield; or, in the mean time, they who suppose Baptism to be valid, though in case of necessity administred by any Christian, nay, according to their *Catechism*, by Jew, Infidel, or Heretick, if he but intend to do what the Church designs hereby, must not presently unchurch any Place, or exclude all Persons that want this full Provision of all needful Helps and Advantages, though some of most immediate Divine Institution. What Allowances God may make for great Necessities, or almost invincible Difficulties and Prejudices, where Men are not wilfully and obstinately wanting to themselves, we cannot or must not determine.

- Observ. 2.* It is not necessary that every Church which may firmly presume upon this lawful and orderly Succession even from the Apostles, should be able to produce the Records of its Conveyance through every Age, and in every single Person by whom it hath past. Few Churches of long continuance have been so happy as to preserve Authentick Registers of all their Transactions from their first Plantation; which must not weaken their Authority, or make doubtful the Effect of their Ministrations, where no positive Evidence is brought to the contrary. The Antients content themselves in delivering down to us the Succession of Bishops in the greater Sees and Mother-Cities, not of Rome only, but of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and others, (though *Bellarmin* insinuates the contrary here) as is most apparent in *Eusebius* &c. The Eminence of their Place and Power, the frequent Resort of other neighbouring Churches to them, from whom they were generally derived, or as Dependant on their Cities in Civil Administrations,

*Ans. to 3d
Object.*

ministrations, which the *Ecclesiastical* usually followed ; these and such like Reasons made them more the notice of all about them, and their Successions more carefully recorded in Church-Writers : Which possibly they might have then done in many of the lesser Churches, had they judged it necessary, when within a very few Centuries, and not through very many Persons, the oldest might have been traced to its first Original. But much different is the case now after so many Changes of Nations and Cities by the violences of War, and other Commotions, for more than sixteen hundred Years since the first Dispersion of the Church.

Some Irregularities and Uncanonical Proceedings in *Observ. 3.* Times of great Schisms, or publick Disturbances, have generally had a very favourable Confirmation to make up those Breaches, not otherwise easily to be healed, and so been interpreted for no Interruption of this Authentical Succession. Such as the Allowance of several Schismatical Ordinations, if not by down-right Hereticks, and other violent and tumultuary Proceedings, which would not beforehand have passed without a very severe Censure, but afterwards have been rather judged charitably to be connived at, then with extreme force and danger to be wholly altered. Without a very candid Interpretation of many publick Occurrences through a long Series of time, all Government would be exposed to endless Confusions. The greatest Reason, Interest and Duty oblige all private Persons not to busie themselves in prying into, much more not invidiously to expose every Punctilio or fancied Defect in the least Formality of the Constitution of those orderly set over them, where no direct encouragement is given to the most presumptuous and sacrilegious Invasions. Neither can we think our most gracious and merciful Redeemer

deemer will severely exact from his humble and obedient Followers the Failure of their Guides, which it was not in their power to amend, or deny them the salutary Benefits of his own Institutions, for want of the most exact Regularity of those who dispense them. In which case I doubt the *Romanists* would have as little Security as any beside.

Inquiry 2. And that brings me to the *Second Inquiry*. How far this *Succession* of Bishops may be granted to the *Roman Church*? The usual Succession of Persons in the Government of the *Church of Rome* from the very Apostles we are not concerned to call into question, though little we have left upon record of many among them but only their bare Names, and that signifies not much. And for the small knowledge we have of any of the rest at the Beginning, or of what past among them for some hundred years after *St. Clemens*, we are beholden to the Writers of other Churches: This so famous Church having left none for some considerable time (that I know of) except the *Decretal* Epistles, as termed, be called in: Which the most ingenuous among them, will scarce own for any other than spurious, or doubtful at best; and yet what great stress has been laid on them? And excepting also the very little Remains in other Authors. If they, or others for them, have been more accurate in preserving the Memorials of the lineal Descent of their Bishops than most Churches (though Learned Men are not yet agreed neither among themselves, or us, about the exact Order of the very first of them.) Yet I suppose the other *Patriarchal Seats* of *Constantinople*, *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, to mention no more, will think themselves as secure of their own Pedigree, and the derivation liable to as few Exceptions.

For if the Charge of *Heresy* break the Connection of this Chain which *Bellarmin* here objects against the *Greeks*, It will be as hard for him to clear the like more notorious Objections against *Liberius*, *Vigilius*, and *Honorius*, to mention nothing of later *Popes*, whose very Gross Errors, if not Blasphemies, if they must not come under that Name, yet certainly some of them deserve every whit as bad, being as destructive to all Religion; wherein may be consulted their own Writers of their Lives: I take no delight to search after such Matters. Not to insist on the foul Depravations of Faith, and good Practice, we charge upon them for so long time, I hope not without great Necessity and Reason.

If *Schismatical Intrusions* presently dissolve this orderly Succession, which the same Author charges so confidently here upon others, He himself will own De Rom. Pont. l. 4. c. 9, 10. *Felix* the Second, and *Vigilius* to have come in so: And that to save any of them, if possible, from the former Imputation, and yet nevertheless to fill up the Number of Lawful *Popes*, yea of Martyrs or Confessors too.

To which may be added the several *Schisms* and *Tumults* from opposite Elections, and sometimes Admissions. As those at the Choice of *Damasus*, *Symmachus* See Platina of them and others. the First, *Boniface* the Second, *Sergius* the First, *John* the Thirteenth, *Benedict* the Fifth, *Leo* the Eighth, *Gregory* the Fifth, *Benedict* the Ninth, *Silvester* the Third, *Benedict* the Tenth, *Nicholas* the Second, *Calistus* the Second, *Honorius* the Second, *Innocent* the Second, *Urban* the Sixth; and that great Schism when three *Anti-Popes*, *Gregory* the Twelfth, *Benedict* the Thirteenth, and *John* the Twenty Third, or (as some will have it) the Twenty Fourth (after the Death of *Alexander* the Fifth) claim'd the Chair of *St. Peter* at the

the same time. Each had his Followers; to end which Contention the Council of *Constance* thought fit to depose them all, and set up *Martin* the Fifth. I mention nothing of *that Story*, which, be sure, was no Tale of the Protestants; but some have observ'd it was first called in question by them. Neither do I insist on the *Popes* Seventy Years Residence at *Avignon* in *France*.

These and such like Accidents, what ever Difficulties, to know who had the best Title, they may afford not easy to be cleared from him that had a mind to seek Objections: Yet seeming for the main no more than what the Intricacies, and Perplexities of the Current of Human Affairs have been ever expos'd to, I should not have taken notice of, had not the Foundation of all Truth or Certainty, and the perpetual duration of the Church of Christ been thought only with safety to be placed upon the suppos'd Rock of the Stability of this Chair, and Indefeasibility of this Church, and, with many, the Infallibility of him that presides therein. And were they not so Bold, to say no more, as to prescribe very strange and extraordinary Rules or Measures to the supream Providence in the Conduct thereof, whatever becomes of any other, or else all must be lost.

We acknowledg the wonderful Providence of God in the preservation of His Faith, and Church, as much from the Corruptions of its own Members, as from the Violence, and Policies of its profess'd Enemies: But we dare not be so presumptuous as to challenge our Saviour with being wanting to his Promise, or complain we want any needful Security to our Faith, or that there is any defect in the Authority or Ministrations of our Spiritual Guides, if any particular Person or set Number of them may possibly be liable to mistake in matters
of

of Faith, or determine otherwise than they ought, or prove false to their Trust. It is a very unsafe, and often fallacious way of arguing, however popular, and that needs less Trouble in Examination, from Persons to things, whereas *these* will continue the same, but *they* are changeable.

1. But then it may be observed of the Roman Succession, that the case seems so *extremely chang'd since the first Times*. So great an Alteration there is in the Persons, and in the Office to which the Succession is now come, that it can hardly be look'd on as the continuation of the same. The *Episcopal Power* is all that we can find for some hundred of years laid claim to, and our Note is only concerned in it, tho in some few single Acts it began by degrees to be stretch'd, so as to put other Bishops upon their Guard and Protestations, as in the case of *Appeals* by the *Africans*. Yet were all Bishops owned to have an equal share in that; all to be of like Power and Authority, all alike Successors of the Apostles, whether at *Rome* or in the meanest City, as in the known Testimonies in *St. Cyprian* and *St. Jerom*, &c. But the Papal Power now challenged and exercised is so vastly and widely different from Episcopacy, that scarce any Propriety of Speech can bring them under the same Name.

But to come to matter of Fact. Notwithstanding the high Elogiums given by the Antients, on particular occasions, to the Roman Church or Bishops, and the very bold Efforts, and very lofty Aspirings of some of these, yet he must have other Eyes, or other Spectacles than we can procure, who can espy any thing like the *Supremacy* and Authority claim'd by the present Papacy in the Principles, or Practice of the Church for

more than *five hundred Years*, which (as hath been observed) could not but have been as discernable in all the Histories of those Times, as the Reference to the power of our Kings, and manner of our Government must be in our own History.

2. Farther indeed there seems no great Reason for them to be much concerned at the Succession of Bishops, that are not very favourable to the very Order. We know what great Opposition in their *Council of Trent* the *Divine Right of Episcopacy* met with from the chief Favourites of that See, when the Determination was so strongly pressed by others. And the Author of these Notes is pleased to determine the Government of the Church not to be chiefly in the Bishops, but properly and intirely *Monarchical, in the Pope only*, and that he derives his Power immediately from Christ: But the Bishops have theirs from him as to Jurisdiction, which is Government.

3. Moreover they have the less reason to except against any Churches for the want of this Apostolical Order, when their very *Catechism*, that multiplies Orders with much less Distinction of Office, makes this *no distinct Order*, but only a different *Degree* of the same Priesthood, the supreme Order in their Church, ascending only gradually from that of a common Presbyter to that of Bishops, Arch-Bishops, Patriarchs, and the Pope himself. Some of the intermediate we know admit no distinct Ordination: Nay, the pretended plenary Power of the Pope hath sometimes by particular Delegation empowered mitred Abbots, but meer Presbyters, to supply the Place of two of the Bishops, if but one be present even in Ordination it self, and

De Pont. Rom.

l. 1. c. 8, 9.

l. 4. c. 24.

and that of a Bishop, as *Bellarmino* in this very Note yields. Many other Instances might be given of their endeavours to advance the first as it were on purpose to fence off the danger of a Rival. To what use else should serve so many Priviledges and Exemptions, long complained of? Their chief Rise hath been upon the Depression of Bishops, and robbing them of their ordinary Power. So quite opposite is the true case from the Jealousies of some about this Primitive Order.

4. Also they will have little cause to glory much in this pretended uninterrupted Succession, when they consider how many *Nullities*, according to their own Principles, may dissolve and separate the closest Connexion thereof. For besides confused Tumultuary, and Simoniackal Promotions, from which their own Writers will scarce free some of them, That one Principle of *the Intention of the Priest*, being necessary to the Effect of any Sacrament, had need make them fearful of relying too much upon it. For in case this were once wanting in some of the principal Sources, through so long a Tract of time, variety of Circumstances, and different Temper of Persons, which many will think no hard matter to suppose, however can never be certainly proved otherwise; by this Rule they cannot be secure of any Order, yea scarce of any true Christian among them.

So I proceed to the *Third Inquiry*, How insufficient a Proof this will afford them of any Great Advantage? *Inquiry 3.* Indeed *Bellarmin* himself seems so Just, as, in part, to yield this in his Answer to the Fourth Objection about this Note. He says an Argument may be brought that there the Church is not, where there is not this

Succession ; but it cannot thence necessarily be gathered, that there the Church is, wheresoever this Succession is : So that it seems no positive Proof with him. Wherefore he thinks fit to exclude the *Eastern Churches*, or break their Succession upon pretences of *Heresy*.

I. For, *First*, This Succession is no sufficient Evidence of the Truth of the Doctrine of any Church. Indeed were *Tradition* so infallible a Conveyance of Truth, as some Men that talk of nothing below Demonstration, would vouch : Were it impossible for any new Opinion to creep into the Church : Were it necessary that Men must believe to Day as they did Yesterday ; and so in short as it were at one Leap, up to the very Apostles, and that the passage of sixteen hundred years were able to make as little Alterations in the Memorials, or Evidences of what Doctrines or Rules of Practice were first delivered by word of Mouth, as the last Nights sleep does of what pass'd the Day before ; Then every Church of Apostolical Foundation (and such were all then Planted) had been, and would still continue as Infallible as the Church of *Rome* thinks herself, and we should not have had any dispute about their Tenets, nor any such Exceptions against their Succession. What Security theirs hath from the Defections which others are charged with, or have been found liable to ; what Evidence may be produc'd that any Church, or Company of Men in the Church, may not add in process of Time some Doctrines and Usages very prejudicial to the Common Faith once delivered to the Saints : And that the Resolution of our Faith is only with safety to be made into the Perpetuity and Infallibility of the Roman Church alone by it self, or its Dependants, we are yet to seek : And
much

much wonder that the Ancients in all their Disputes with *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks*, should take so great a compass to confute their Adversaries from *Scripture*, *Reason*, and *other Authorities* beside what the *See of Rome* afforded; and not, with our modern Controversists, make short work in appealing to this last only effectual way of Decision, had it then been received, and known for so fundamental a Principle of Christianity as is now pretended.

2. As this uninterrupted Succession of Bishops, where yielded, is no sufficient Proof of the Truth of the Doctrine of any Church; so neither is it *a warrantable Ground of the claim of Superiority over another Church*, which hath not so clear evidences thereof. And if these two fail those we have to deal with, they will gain very little by this *Note*. For as the Succession may, yea ought to be supposed good, when sufficient Proof appears not to the contrary: So where there really appears Want of this Succession, and need to to fly to other Churches for the Relief thereof, yet this charitable Assistance which all ought most freely and willingly to offer, or lend to each other, does not presently give one the Power over the other for ever after. The Apostles themselves seem not to derive their Power over the Churches by them planted so much from the Success of their Labours, as from their immediate Divine Commission, intimated in the Beginning of their Epistles, though the one was a great Endearment and Enforcement to the others, and so it ought to be. We may suppose sometimes greater Churches converted by the Ministry of the less, who were so happy as to receive the Faith before them. Younger Churches have many times leapt over the
Heads

Heads of much Elder, and the Inferior having gained some considerable Advancement in a Civil Account, have soon arrived at a proportionable Promotion in the Ecclesiastical, as particularly the Church of *Constantinople*. And somewhat like may be observed in the Changes of other Cities : Superior Bishops are ordained by those, over whom they after have some Authority. For if not only Priority of Order, but also Superiority of Jurisdiction be unalterably entailed upon the Eldest ; I doubt the Church of *Jerusalem*, which was certainly the *Mother-Church*, must be also the *Mistress* of all. And if that Line be extinct, I believe there are many other Branches it must descend to before it come to the *Roman*. Some have disputed whether *Britain* it self had not a Church as soon. And that they should ground a claim from what they will not yield to others sufficient for the same purpose, seems very unequal.

But surely the Designs and Effects of this Spiritual Warfare, are not like those usually of the Carnal, meerly to enlarge the Dominions of their Leaders, and advance the Power of their Governors. The Churches conquests consist in the multitude of Souls gained to Christ, in the new Plantations, or farther Growth and Improvements of all Christian Graces, and Vertues in Mens Minds ; in fastning some Good and Benefit on them, and not in gaining new outward Dependances to our selves, any farther than the needful Preservation of Peace, and Order, in every distinct Dominion. What is more smells too strong of Worldly Policy, Temporal Gain, or Secular Ambition. to have any true Place here. When Men are more industrious to promote and encourage every where sincere Piety,
and

and Probity, and less concern'd in the claims of unlimited Sovereignty and Power, then may we think true Religion, and not other Interest, to be the first Mover with them.

But to consider a little, the *Cardinal's* Testimonies here. The *Second* out of St. *Augustin*, *Psalmo contra partem Donati*, being the fullest and alone pertinent to their purpose, I single out. " *Numerate, inquit, Sacerdotes, vel ab ipsa Sede Petri, & in ordine illo Patrum, quis cui successerit, videte; Ipsa est Petra quam non vincunt Superba Inferorum Porta.* As to the latter part of it where the stress lies, we have this Argument that it must be interpreted only as an occasional Allusion, that in many places where he purposely expounds that Passage of the Gospel, he makes Christ himself, confessed by St. *Peter*, to be the Rock on which he built his Church; as *Retract. l. 1. 21. Tom. 1. p. 30.* and in *cap. 21. Sti. Johan. Tom. 9. p. 572. Super hanc Petram quam confessus se, &c.* And indeed asserts no more but matter of Fact in a single case, that the Seat of St. *Peter* (to which the *Donatists* when condemned by the *African Bishops* upon their Appeal to the *Emperour* were referred) was as a *Rock*, which the proud Gates of Hell (so he resembles their Presumptions) doe not prevail against: That is, the cause was given against them by the *Roman Bishop*, and others joyn'd with him. Where though some Allusion may be made to the Place in the Gospel; yet it is not fair to strain an Argument thence against the plain and expressly designed Exposition of it; especially among such short Strictures, of which that Tract is made up. And for the other Testimonies in *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, and *Epi-*

Epiphanius ; We acknowledg their Arguments good against upstart Teachers of new Doctrine. But they expressly joyn *Succession of Doctrine with that of Persons*, otherwise it had been of no Validity, unless by referring their Adversaries (who were not much moved by Authority) to the evidences of the conveyance of the opposite Opinions to them from the first Originals. The other two places in *St. Aug.* and that of *Optatus* against the *Donatists*, imply no more to those presumptuous Inclosers of the whole Church within their own narrow Bounds, and Beginners of it from themselves, than a Challenge for them to shew any thing of the Apostolical Original thereof, or after-conveyance like other Churches, and particularly the *Roman* wherein *St. Augustin Epist.* 165, after a Catalogue of the Bishops thereof, thus closes, *In hoc ordine successionis nullus Donatista Episcopus invenitur* : And in all his Disputes with them lays the charge of the Guilt of their Schism upon the separation from all the Churches, dispersed over the World, according to Prophetical and Evangelical Declarations. No Person or Place to prejudicate to all others, it follows in the fore-mentioned, *ut certa sit spes fidelibus quæ non in Homine sed in Domino collocata*. All which and more, to any that consult the References throughout, rather confirm our Claim. We have as good Evidences and Conveyances as our Adversaries can challenge, we pretend not to any new Doctrine : But for the main ours are what themselves dare not but own. What we reject among them are not only as Additions, which none must make to the first Principles of Religion, but over and above very dangerous and destructive to the common Faith of both. For the Proof of such Doctrines, or continuance of it, we need no new Miracles, or new Authority from Heaven, but

but an orderly conveyance of the old, and that we still, Thanks be to God, retain.

And truly *Bellarmin's* Inference from the mentioned Citations will carry in it little or no force, but seems rather to incline the contrary way. If they, says he, made so much of the continued Succession of 12, 20, or 40 Bishops, how much may we of more than 200? Certainly the Argument from Succession here is much stronger the nearer it comes to the Original, from which all the Authority, and Virtue in the following are derived; the Water may be supposed clearer, and more natural the nearer to the Fountain-Head. There is at least some danger from every Remove or Change made. I am apt to think they themselves will hardly suppose they have a better Argument from Succession, than those had 1200, or more Years since. For if it be good now, be sure it was so then. But it will not follow alternately, if then good, it must hold so still. The Case may be presum'd much different in the Succession of Ecclesiastical Dignities, and Secular; in this latter it may be suppos'd the Title gathers still more strength by the length of its Continuance, is more confirm'd by long Possession, & many superinduct Obligations, but was, it may be, weakest in its Beginnings, as in most particular Governments, now, when of a meer Human Original, so far as we may with due Modesty and Reverence look that way. But Spiritual Power in whomsoever, where Legitimate, can only descend at first from an immediate Divine Commission, and that we may suppose gains nothing by passing through Human Hands, and Infirmities, being most strong and powerful in its first rise. Indeed did the *Cardinal* only argue for a Temporal and Ecclesiastical Monarchy, and would he be content to begin it after

Pope Gregory the First, and then to rise by degrees for a while: Succession appears to me the best Argument they have.

However it is much easier to shew fair Evidences of the unaltered conveyance of the same Truth from one to another, when it hath gone through so few Hands, and that the eldest bears its Date, but a very few Centuries of (as *Irenæus* expressly in the place cited, *l. 3. c. 3.* and *Epiphanius Hom. 27. Carpocrat. p. 104.*) than it can be when they are multiplied to the present number, and the Foot-steps of its continued Passage are almost worn out through so long a tract of Time, and numerous cross Accidents.

Yet, to give them their due, the eminent Zeal of several of their first Bishops, that Sealed to the Custody of the true Faith with their Blood, being still as it were in view of their Persecutors; their general Constancy thereto, in which so many wavered or fell in the time of the *Arian* Persecution; the Relief, and Refuge they then, and after, afforded to such as suffered in that, or like Causes; as well as the Prerogative of their Place in the *Imperial City*, and the current Tradition of their Churches first Foundation, by the joint Labours of those chief Apostles *St. Peter*, and *St. Paul*, these gave them great credit in those Ages; and while they used their Power so well, every one was ready to enlarge it, and to flee thither for Sanctuary when oppress'd. In which case Men are very apt to speak bountifully of their Patrons. And no marvel, if they single out sometimes so venerable a Name and Authority to oppose, and even to bear down the impertinent Obstinacy, and peevish Presumption of every new upstart Schismatick or Heretick, that would dictate to us strange and unheard-of Prin-

Principles, and unchurch all before, or beside themselves, and must begin the Date of it from themselves: For thus most of the Citations mention'd are plainly levell'd. And in such a Case we should judg the arguing sufficient still to silence such an insolent Boaster, though we should begin the Succession no sooner than the time they ended, and when we own Religion began to decline in some parts, but sure not to expire. Nay I could add, though we should rise no higher than the Reformation it self, as late as it was; and how contemptuously soever they are pleased sometimes to speak of the happy Instruments thereof.

An extraordinary Providence also seems to have attended the Preservation of them so long under the *Arian Gothick Kings*, and a strange temporal Felicity in being still Gainers in the end by all the Invasions and Calamities incident to so many Changes of Government, by which most beside were Losers. But I should think if they consulted *Scripture, Reason, and Experience* of former Examples with present sensible Observation, more than any fancied Schemes and Models of their own, what they would judg best to have done: They might think it not unlikely, at least be more willing to stand to the tryal whether it be not so, that upon so long a continued and still growing accession of Wealth and Greatness to their Church, many and great Corruptions might creep in: which we charge them with, and have only removed by the Reformation, without turning them or our Ancestors out of the Church before, or our selves since.

If the Favours they have so long enjoyed make them more industrious and cautious in the Examination of themselves to reform whatever they can find amiss, and to be more charitably helpful, and beneficial to others,
they

they will be far better employed than in grasping at still more Power, and justifying all that they teach, or do, by the (oft to us) unaccountable Successes of Providence; which the worst Causes have fled to for shelter, and the worst Men, when they had nothing else to plead.

God Almighty give us all Grace entirely to devote all our Studies and Labours to the Service of our Great Master, and the best, and most certain Benefit of his Church, in the Furtherance of Sound Faith, and Universal Holiness of Life, in all true Piety, Probity, Charity, and Peaceable Communion among all that in every place call on the Name of the Lord, theirs and ours: Which will afford us a far more comfortable Reckoning at the great Day of Account, than to busie our selves in thrusting all beside out of the Church here, and pronouncing Condemnation against them for hereafter; or, on the other side, in carrying on still unaccountable Prejudices, and endless Separations. The God of Wisdom, Truth, and Peace will (I hope) at length give us a right Understanding in all Things.

T H E E N D.

L O N D O N,

Printed by *J. D.* for *Richard Chiswel* at the Rose and Crown in *St. Paul's Church-Yard*, 1687.

The Sixth Note of the CHURCH EXAMINED,

VIZ.

Agreement in Doctrin^{or}e with the Primitive Church.

Sexta Nota est Conspiratio in Doctrinâ cum Ecclesiâ Antiquâ.
Bellar. L. iv. c. 9. de Notis Ecclesiæ.

I M P R I M A T U R.

May 19. 1687.

Guil. Needham.

VVEE are very willing to own this for a true
Mark of the Church, its Agreeing with the
Doctrin^e of the Primitive Church; and we are so far from
confuting Bellarmin for his giving of it, that we do not
doubt but he has hereby *confuted* himself and the whole
Cause of the Roman Church: for if we may be allowed to
go back to the Primitive Church, and to examine the
Doctrin^e and Belief of *that* in order to find out what is
the true Church at present, then the pretended Infallibi-
lity of the present Church, and the Necessity of receiv-
ing and believing all that she imposes, must be *set by*, till
it appears that she requires the same Doctrin^e, and no
other, than what was taught and believed by the Primi-
tive Church: For according to this *Note* it does not ap-
pear which is the true Church, till it first appears that
Q it

it agrees with the Doctrine of the Primitive; and till it appears that it is a true Church, it cannot sure appear to be an Infallible one: for it cannot be pretended that Infallibility belongs to any but the true Church, and therefore it must be first known that the present Church agrees with the Primitive, before it can be known that she is an Infallible Guide or Teacher: So that we manifestly gain this first by this *Note* of the Church, that all those big and blustering Claims to Infallibility must be postpon'd and laid aside, till that of agreeing with the Doctrine of the Primitive Church be made out, and when that is done we shall not have quite so much reason to question her Infallibility. We desire nothing more than to have the matter brought to this Issue, Whether the Doctrines of the *Reformed* or the *Romish* Church do agree best with the Primitive? Since for Reasons well known to themselves, and very much suspected by others, they are so willing to *goe off* from *Scripture*, and to decline the Judgment of *that* as incompetent and insufficient in most of the Controversies between us, we are very ready to leave them to be decided by any other indifferent *Arbitrator*; for we think it is a little odd and unreasonable they should make themselves the *only Judges* of what is in difference between us; and therefore we are very ready to stand to the *Award* and *Umpirage* of the Primitive Church, and we are not in the least afraid to venture our whole Cause to the sentence and decision of *That*: for tho the *Scripture* be our *only Rule* of Faith and Doctrine necessary to be believed by us, because we know of no other *Revelation* but *that*, and nothing but *Revelation* makes any Doctrine *necessary* to be believed; yet we are very willing to take the sense and meaning of *Scripture* both from *it self*, and from the *Primitive Church* too: so according to *Vincentius Lyrinensis*, to have
the

the line of Scriptural Interpretation be directed by the Rule of Ecclesiastical and Catholick Judgment; † that is, to have the Primitive Church direct us in interpreting Scripture where it stands in need of it, or there is any Controversy about its meaning; Let the Scripture therefore as sensed by the Primitive Church, and not by the private Judgment of any particular Man, be allowed and agreed by us to be the Rule of our Faith; and let that be accounted the true Church, whose Faith and Doctrine is most conformable and agreeable with the Primitive.

† Ut Prophetica & Apostolica interpretationis linea secundum Ecclesiastici & Catholici sensus normam dirigatur. Vincent. Lyvins. contra hæres. c. 2.

We desire nothing more than to find out the true Church by the true Faith, and we think this is the true way to find it out: For Christian Faith is prior and antecedent to the Christian Church; and that must be first known and supposed, before we can know any such thing as a Church; for 'tis the Faith makes the Church, and not the Church the Faith: and therefore the true Church is to be known by the true Doctrine, and not the true Doctrine by the Church, as is some Folks way.

If a Church then has never so many other glorious Marks, yet if it has not the true Faith, according to the Rule before laid down, it cannot be the true Church; and if it have never so true a Succession of Pastors deriving their Power in an uninterrupted Line from the Apostles, yet if it have not a true Succession of Doctrine too from them, it is not a true Church: So far indeed as it holds and professes the common Christian Faith, so far, for that very Reason, it is a true Church; and so far we allow the Roman to be a true Church; and so far they cannot deny us to be one neither, as the same Faith & Fundamentals of Christianity are received and believed by both of us: for this Faith being the same to both of us, makes us both so far to be true Churches upon the same grounds; but so far as we differ in Matters of Faith, whether we

or they be the true Church, is the question between us, and we are willing to have this determined by the Primitive Church: If the Faith then and Doctrine of the Roman Church, wherein it differs from us, be the same with the Faith and Doctrine of the Primitive Church; then that is the true Church: If it be contrary, and unagreeable to the Faith and Doctrine of the Primitive, then it is not the true Church, but a *false and erroneous one*.

And here we ought to make a *particular* enquiry and examination of all those Matters of Faith which are in controverſie between us, and bring each of them to the *Test and Trial*, and ſee which Church does moſt agree in all thoſe *diſputed* Doctrines with the Doctrine of the Primitive Church; for here we muſt be allowed to examine *particular* Doctrines that are in difference between us; and every *private Chriſtian* who is ſeeking for the true Church, muſt, if he would find it by this Mark of *Bellarmino*, be allowed to inquire into and examine the *Doctrines* of the preſent Church, and ſee whether they are agreeable to thoſe of the Primitive or no; and this he muſt do by his private Judgment, and by the beſt means and helps he can uſe to this purpoſe: for he is not yet ſuppoſed to have *found out* the true Church, but to be *finding it out* by this *Mark* given of it; and till he has found it out by this *Mark* and Direction, he cannot be under its guidance and conduct, ſo that he muſt make uſe of his own Reaſon and Judgment at leaſt till he has thus found it; that is, he muſt have the Liberty to ſearch and inquire into the Faith and Doctrines of the Primitive Church, and to judg for himſelf as well as he can by his own beſt Diſcretion, and the beſt helps he can uſe, which Church does beſt agree in its Faith and Doctrines with the Primitive; and according as he ſhall upon his
own

own enquiry and examination find, so he must choose *that Church* which he thinks is the *truest*; but he must not give himself up to the absolute guidance and direction of any Church, at least till he has by this way found out the true; which is another manifest *Advantage* that we have by this Note against our Adversaries, who are rather for bearing Men down with the bold pretence of *Infallibility*, and the terrible fright of Damnation out of the true Church, rather than suffering them according to this true *Method* to find it out.

And as he must thus use his own Judgment in an impartial search into the Doctrines of the Primitive Church, which will have as many Inconveniences in it, I fear, as they are apt to object against searching, to this end, into the Scriptures; so he must examine all the *particular* Doctrines that are controverted between *both* Churches, to see which are most agreeable to the Faith of the Primitive; for he cannot know this in the *Lump* and by the *Gross*; and to tell him, as they sometimes do, that 'tis impossible for their Church to have departed from the Faith of the Primitive, and that the present Age could not alter from the Doctrine of the foregoing, and so upward; this is not to make the Primitive Faith a *Note* of the present Church, but to *prevent* all enquiry about this *Note*, and to make it wholly useless and insignificant.

He that will therefore make use of this *Mark* to know the true Church by, must be supposed and allowed to inquire into the Doctrine of the Primitive Church about all those particular Controversies and Matters of Faith that are in difference between us, and must not have his Enquiry *stopt* and *precluded* by any general Pretences of the Infallibility either of *Oral Tradition*, or of the *present Church*, but must freely and impartially examin the
parti-

particular Doctrines that are controverted, that so he may bring every one of them to the *Touchstone* of the Primitive Faith, and try whether they are agreeable to the same or no; and according as he finds this; that is, whatsoever Church he finds to hold the same *Doctrine* with the Primitive in all the particular Points of difference, *That* he must conclude to be the true Church from this *Note* given of it.

Our Adversaries do not usually care to enter into particular Points of Controversy, wherein they are very sensible they shall be sooner foiled and baffled; and therefore they generally wave *those* which are capable of being made more plain and evident to most Mens Capacities; and they chuse rather to dispute and wrangle about more general and intricate Matters, in which there is some more room to cavil, and to amuse and perplex themselves and others with seeming Difficulties; so that tho particular Controversies may be made very plain, and it appears often in them as clear almost as the Light, on which side the Truth is; as, Whether Prayers ought to be in a known Tongue? Whether the Communion ought to be in both kinds? Whether the Scriptures are to be read by the People? and the like; yet to avoid those, and to prevent the Disadvantage of such manifest and particular Points, they carry the Dispute off to other things, and run into the general Controversies of *Infalibility* and *Church-Authority*, and *Resolution of Faith*, and a *Judg in Controverses*, and the like; and here they think there is more room for Cavil and Sophistry, and they can hereby lead Men if not into *Scepticism* and *Doubtfulness*, yet into a *Maze* and *Labyrinth*, where they shall not so easily *get out*: Which *way* of theirs seems to me, just as if a Person in a plain Controversy about Weight or Measure which were otherwise easy to be determined,

terminated, should, to avoid *that*, think fit to run into the perplext Dispute, What was the true Standard of Weights and Measures? or everlastingly wrangle about that Question, Whether Matter consisted of Divisible or Indivisible Parts? and because he could raise Difficulties here, and keep up a long and intricate Controversy about those Matters, would not be brought to yield, that a Pound was heavier than an Ounce, or an Ell longer than an Inch. I cannot but think that some of our particular Controversies may be almost as clearly decided as those two; and that the running into some general ones, is as remote and sophistical as the other.

We must therefore, according to this *Note* of the Church, not be *foreprized* or *prevented* with any general and more perplext Dispute, but we must fairly examine all the particular Doctrines of the Church, and see whether they are agreeable with those of the Primitive Church or no, before we can find out the true Church at present; not that the true Church we are to look for, is confined to any particular Place or Country, but like a great *Homogenial* Body, every Part of which is of the same nature with the Whole; wherever the true Primitive Faith is profest in all the Parts of it, there is a True Church; and all particular Churches being united together in the same Bond of Faith, do make up the Catholick Church over all the World. If there were but one Particular Church upon the whole Earth, that did profess this True Faith, *that* alone might be called the *Catholick Church*, because that alone had that Catholick Faith, which did properly make and constitute the True Church: But this Faith being common to a great many Particular Churches, this makes them to be all true, and all Catholick, as to Faith; but as to Place, 'tis ridiculous to call any one *Catholick*, and as absurd.

as to call a Part the Whole ; in that sense no Church is Catholick, in the other every Church is that holds the *Whole* Christian Faith : We are not therefore to seek for any Particular Church, that shall usurp to it self the Name of *Catholick*, in exclusion to all others ; but for any Church that maintains the true Catholick Faith profess'd by the Primitive, which upon that account is a True Church, and acknowledged so by this Mark which is here given of it.

To find out such a one, and to distinguish it from others, we must very carefully enquire into all the particular Doctrines and Points of Faith which are held by it, and see whether they are agreeable to the Faith and Doctrine of the Primitive Church ; and according to this Method, and saving to our selves all the forementioned Advantages of it, we are very willing to have the Difference adjusted between us and the Church of *Rome*, and to have it decided by this *Note*, whether we or they are the True Church ; that is, whether we or they, in all Matters of Controversy between us, do most agree with the Doctrine of the Primitive Church.

And here is a very large *scope* offered to me, and what has taken up a great many *Volumes* on both sides ; so that to most People *Scripture*, one would think, should be a shorter and an easier, and therefore a better way to know the True Church by ; but since our Adversaries are not willing to leave the Case to that, we are ready to accept of the Primitive Church to be Judg between us ; and, as has been often offered before by Bishop *Jewel* and others, we shall be very willing to stand to *its* award and decision : for however some few Divines of the Reformation, before they were so well acquainted with Antiquity, and when they could not so well distinguish what was genuine, from what was spurious

spurious and corrupted by your Church, were at first especially more jealous and distrustful than they need to have been of it, and unwilling to venture their Cause to any other Sentence but that of Scripture, which had so plainly decided for them, and was indeed the most proper to be appealed to; yet the greatest number, and the most learned of the Protestant Writers, have never declined the Judgment of the Primitive Church, but next to the inspired Writings of the Apostles, have always esteemed and been willing to be determined by it: And we are well assured, that the Ancient Church, even the *Roman* it self, as well as the whole Christian besides, is in all material Points on the Protestant side; and a perfect Stranger, if not an utter Enemy to those new Articles of Faith, and Corruptions of Doctrine, which have been since brought into the *Western* Church, and which we have for that Reason *protested* against, because they were unknown and contrary to the Faith and Doctrine of the Primitive Church.

It would too much exceed the set Limits of this Paper, to make this out so fully as might easily be done, by going through the chiefest Points of Difference between us; *Bellarmino* in his Discourse upon this *Note*, goes wholly off from it, and chuses rather to pursue *Luther* and *Calvin*, and some other worthy *Reformers*, through all the Paths of Calumny and Slander; but I shall not follow him, to take him off from those false and injurious Representations he hath made of their Doctrines: If any Body has the curiosity to see the Art of *Misrepresenting* in its greatest perfection, let him but read that Chapter; but if he will see it as perfectly shamed and exposed, let him read Bishop *Morton's* long and learned Answer to it *. We are examining the Do-

**Apologia Catholica*, p. 61. to p. 278.

† *Advice to the
Confuter of Bel-
larmino.*

not of *particular Men*; and had *Calvin*, or others, taught any such Doctrines, as are very fallly there laid to their Charge, I know none had been concerned in them but *themselves*; and no Church could have been prejudiced by them any farther, than it had *received* them: I shall therefore keep more close to *Bellarmino's Note*, tho not to his *Method* upon it; and I assure a late *Adviser* †; 'tis not the design of *confuting* him, but setting Men *right* in the way to the True Religion, and the True Church, when others are so busy to draw them off by false Marks and Pretences, which is the cause of this *Undertaking*.

I confess it would be too *prolix*, as *Bellarmino* says, to produce all the Testimonies of the Ancients, thereby to shew what was the Doctrin of the Primitive Church, in every particular Point controverted between us; I shall therefore offer only some plain and brief Remarks, by which the sense of the Primitive Church may be undeniably known in most of the Controversies, and by which it will appear what was the Doctrin of the Church then, and how contrary that of the Church of *Rome* is now to it.

And here I should first begin with the most Primitive, that is, with the *Apostolick Church*, which truly and only deserves the Title of being *Mother and Mistress* of all Christian Churches that ever were or shall be in the World; it is as vain as arrogant for any later and particular Church to assume *that* to it self, which is but a *Sister-Church* at most, and younger than some of the rest; and tho more fine and proud, yet not half so honest and uncorrupt. This *Apostolick Church*, which was founded and governed by the Apostles over all the World, is the true Standard of the Christian Church; and as in revealed Religion, *That which is first, is true*,
according

according to *Tertullian's* * Axiom, because it comes nearest to the first pure Fountain of Revelation; so as he adds, *That is first which is from the Beginning, and from the Apostles.* We should first then examine what was the Faith and Doctrine of the *Apostolick Church*, the greatest and almost only account of which we have in their own *Canonical Writings*, which are received and allowed as such by the whole Christian Church; and in these our Adversaries find so little of their own late and new Doctrines, that they cannot but own that these are insufficient to authorise and establish most of them without the Authority of the present Church, and without the help of *unwritten Traditions.*

* Id verum quod prius, id prius quod ab initio, ab initio quod ab Apostolis. *Tertul. de prescript. l. 4.*

When we produce Scripture against our Adversaries, we then produce the only Authentick Records of the *Apostolick Church*, and the only certain account we have of the Faith and Doctrine of the most Primitive Church: let them object therefore never so much against Scripture as a *Rule of Faith*, yet whilst it contains the only sure *Testimony* of what was taught and believed by the first Christian Church, so far as any of these Doctrines are not in Scripture, so far they cannot appear to be the Doctrine of the *Apostolick Church*, and whilst we hold all that Faith, and all those Doctrines that are contained in Scripture, we hold all that can be *known* to be so in the most pure and most Primitive Church; and whatsoever they have added to Scripture, which they will needs have to be but an imperfect Rule of Faith, they have added, so far as can be known, to the Doctrine of the *Apostolick Church*: for if Scripture be not the only Rule of *that*, yet it is the only *Historical Account* we have of it. But I shall not at present deal with them out of Scripture, tho as it is only a Record and Evidence of the Apostolical Faith, they will count this but a Trick, I know, to draw

The Sixth Note of the Church,

them into a Scripture Dispute, which they are mighty averſe to, and which they deſign to avoid by an Appeal from that to the Primitive Church; we will go on therefore with our *Note* as they, I ſuppoſe, mean and underſtand it, and that we may not be too troubleſom to them with Scripture and the Apoſtolick Writings, we will go ſeveral Ages lower, even down to thoſe Times wherein the Church was in its glorious State under the firſt Chriſtian Emperors, and whether *their* Doctrines or *ours* were moſt agreeable to thoſe of this Primitive Church: Let us now come briefly to enquire in ſome particular Inſtances and by ſome few ſhort Remarks and Obſervations.

And Firſt: Was any ſuch thing as their pretended *Supremacy* then allowed of, when in the firſt general Council at Nice; * *There was a limited Power*

* Τα ἀρχαία ἔθνη κελεύειται, τὰ ἐν Ἀιγυπτίῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ Πενταπόλει ὡς καὶ ἡ Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπισκοπὴν πάντων τούτων ἔχειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν. Ἐπειδὴ καὶ τὸ ἐν τῇ Ρώμῃ ἐπισκόπου τὸ το σύνθηρος ἐστὶν ὁμοίως καὶ κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπαρχίαις τὰ πρεσβεία σὺζέδει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. Conc. Nicen. Can. 6.

assigned to the Bishop of Rome, as there was to the other Metropolitans of Alexandria, and Antioch, who were to keep their Bounds set them by antient Custom, which is utterly inconsistent with an Universal Supremacy over the whole Church, by a Divine Right; as is since pretended and claimed

contrary to all Antiquity. For the next General Council appoints *the Bishop of Constantinople to have Prerogatives of Honour, next to the Bishop of Rome, because that was New Rome*; † ſo that it was the Imperial City of Rome which gave the Honour of being the firſt Biſhop in the Church, and not a *Divine Institution* or a *Succession* from St. Peter; and when *Constantinople*, by the Emperor's removing

† Τὸν μέντοι Κωνσταντίνου πόλεως ἐπίσκοπον ἔχειν τὰ πρεσβεία τῇ πρώτῃ μετὰ τῆς Ρώμης ἐπισκοπῆς, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὴν πρῶτην Ρώμην. Concil. Constantinop. Can. 3.

thither, became the next great City, the Biſhop partook of the Honour of the City; And in the Fourth General Council at *Calcedon*, had for that Reason equal Pri-

Priviledges conferred upon him with the Bishop of Old *Rome*; || as the Fathers expressly declare: To which I shall add the famous Case of Appeals, which was challenged about the Year 418 by Pope *Zosimus*, over the African Church, not by Divine Right, but by a pretended Ecclesiastical Canon, which was found afterwards to be forged, and the Power of the

|| Κι γὰρ τὸ θεῖον ἢ πρεσβυ-
τέρας Ρώμης διὰ τὸ βαρπλευ-
τῶν πάλιν ἐκείνην, οἱ πατέρες
ἐκείνης ἀπο διεδώχοντα πρεσ-
βεῖα, καὶ τὰ αὐτῶν σκόπων κινέ-
μενοι δι' ἐχάτων πεντήκοντα θεο-
φιλέταισι ὁπισκοποῖσι, ἵστα πρεσ-
βεῖα ἀπένειμαν τῷ ἱ. νέας Ρώ-
μης ἐξιστάτω θεῖον. Concil.
Calced. Can. 28.

Church of *Rome* to receive Appeals, or to judge the Causes of other Churches, was fully disowned and disclaimed; * And this with the Exemption of the Churches of *Milan*, *Ravenna*, and *Aquileia* from the Jurisdiction of the Church of *Rome*, tho they were so near Neighbours to it, even in *Italy* it self, is enough to give full Satisfaction to any reasonable Man, what a different Opinion the Primitive Church had of the Church of *Rome*, from what it now has of it self, concerning an Universal Supremacy, and of its being the *Mother and Mistress* of all Churches.

* Concil.
Carthag. 6.

The next most peculiar Doctrine of Popery is *Transubstantiation*, which as it was formerly owned by *Valentia* (a) De Tran-
(a) and *Cusanus* (b) and a great many of the School-men sub. l. 2. c. 7.
(b) Exercit.
Scotus Durandus and others (c) not to have been the Do- l. 6. Scr. 40.
(c) Vid. Pref.
ctrine of the Primitive Church, so it has been lately pro- ad Johan.
ved at large by one of their own Communion (d), tho Major.
if for that reason it may be thrown out from being an (d) A Treatise
Article of Faith by the Members of the Roman Church, written by an
they will leave but very few proper to themselves ac- Author of the
cording to the Principle of that Gentleman, to wit, the Church of Rome
making not the present but the Primitive Church a Rule touching Tran-
of their Faith, which if they will universally follow, substantiation.
it will lead them quite out of the Roman Church as well
as out of that single Error of it; we have such excellent
Treatises

* See Discourse
of Transubstanti-
ation. Transub-
stantiation no
Doctrine of the
Primitive Fa-
thers. The Do-
ctrine of the Tri-
nity and Tran-
substantiation
compared. 1. par.

Treatises of late, * about this, which prove it beyond all Exception, and beyond all Answer to be no Doctrine of the Primitive Church, that I shall add nothing about it, but only these two Observations.

First, That it appears not by any Liturgy, or Eucharistick Form that was ever used by the Church, no not by the Roman Canon it self, which is much ancients than this Doctrine, and therefore not so conformed to it; That the Church ever used any *Prayer* to this purpose at the Eucharist, that the Substance of the Sacramental Elements should be changed or done away, and the Flesh and Blood of Christ substituted instead of them, under the Species or Accidents, but only, that they might be made the Body and Blood of Christ by the Spirits coming down upon them, so that it was only a Spiritual and Sacramental, not a Substantial Change of them that was ever prayed for, or ever believed; for if the Church had always had this Faith, it would surely have sometimes prayed in it.

Secondly, I observe that in those Times when this Doctrine came first into the Church, which was a little before *Berengarius*, it was so new and *raw*, that it was not fully digested, nor perfectly understood even by those who then held it, as appears by that blundering Recantation which was drawn up for him after the Examination of no less than three Popes and five Synods, wherein he is made to say, That *after Consecration the true Body and Blood of Christ is not only Sacramentally but sensibly and truly handled and broke by the Hands of the Priests, and ground by the Teeth of the Faithful.* † This *sensible* and *true handling*, and breaking, and grinding Christ's Bo-

† Post Consecrationem verum Corpus & Sanguinem Christi

sensualiter non solum Sacramento, sed veritate manibus Sacerdotum tractari, frangi, & fidelium dentibus atteri. *Grat. de Consec. dist. 2. cap.*

dy is so strange and dreadful a thing, that the Glossator observes this upon it, That *unless you do understand these Word of Berengarius in a sound sense*, * that is, contrary to what the Words signify and mean, *you will fall into a greater Heresy than that of Berengarius himself*; by which it appears that this Monster of Transubstantiation, as a great Man || of their own afterwards calls it, was so unformed and mishapen a thing at that time, that it was a sign it was then but new come into the World, and had need of being farther licked into a better shape.

* *Nisi sane intelligas verba Berengarii in majorem incidas heresim quam ipse habuit.* Glos. Ib. || Perrone. See the excellent Preface to a Discourse on the Holy Eucharist in two great points.

If Transubstantiation were then but *new*, those other Doctrines which have issued from it, and are its proper Production, could not be *old*; such as *Adoration of the Sacrament, Communion in one kind, Solitary Masses, and the Proper and Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass*: And therefore I shall not say any thing of them, since their Date will be owned to be as late as that of Transubstantiation; and tho they may not follow from it, yet they cannot be maintained or believed without it; so that what has been said against the one, takes away the very Foundation of the other.

As to the *Number of the Sacraments*, tho the Council of *Trent* has declared this to be exactly *Seven*, and made it an Article of Faith to believe so; yet no Man sure will have the confidence to say, That this *Number* was determined by the Primitive Church, when they can bring no Author who makes any mention of such a Number till 1100 Years after Christ; and *Bellarmin* thinks it unreasonable *we should require them to shew this either in the Scriptures or the Fathers*; † tho if it be an Article of Faith, which must be believed upon pain of Damnation, there ought to be something to shew for it, one would think, out of one of them.

† Non debere adversarios petere ut ostendamus in Scripturis aut Patribus non men Septenacii numeri Sacramentorum. *Bellar. de effect. Sacram. l. 2. c. 24.*

* In his enim
etiam docti di-
versa sentire
inveniuntur,
quia super his
varia ac pene
adversa tradi-
diſſe videntur
Doctores.

Lomb. Sent. l. 4.
diſt. 17.

¶ De Purgato-
rio fere nulla
in antiquis
Scriptoribus
mentio. *Alfonſ.
de Caſtro contra
Heret.* l. 8. p.

115.

* Roſſenſ.
contra Luther.
Art. 18.

† Nos non nativitatſ diem celebramus cum ſit dolorum atque tentationum introitus ſed mortis
diem celebramus utpote omnium dolorum depoſitionem. *Comment. in Job apud Origen.* l. 3.

Was the *Necceſſity of Auricular Confefſion* a Doctrin of the Primitive Church, when in the time of *Peter Lombard*, he tells us, * *That Learned Men were found to have different Sentiments about it*, and that the Doctores delivered themſelves variously and differently upon it, and therefore it could not be the Doctrin of the Church then, but of this ſee a learned Treatiſe written on purpoſe.

Was the *Roman Purgatory* a Doctrin of the Primitive Church, of which *Alphonſus à Caſtro* confeſſes, *There is almoſt no mention of it in any of the ancient Writers?* ¶ Bp *Fiſher* * is of the ſame mind with him, and that old Chriſtian Cuſtom of celebrating the day of their Friends Death as a Feſtival and Day of rejoycing, becauſe they were then releaſed from all Pain and Sorrow, † is to me a plain Argument they did not in the leaſt believe any ſuch thing.

* Earum uſus
in Eccleſiâ vi-
detur ſero re-
ceptus. *Alfonſus
de Caſtro.* l. 8.
p. 115.
† Cajet. Opuſc.
15. c.

What ſhall we think then of *Indulgences* as they relate to Purgatory; Had the ancient Church any ſuch Notion of them? But meerly as abatements of Canonical Penance, and Purgatory, I ſuppoſe is no part of *that*. Does not *Alfonſus* own, *That they were received very late into the Church?* * And *Cajetan* ſays, *There is no Authority of Scriptures, or of any Fathers Greek or Latin, that bring them to our Knowledge.* †

Prayers and Oblations for the Dead, I confeſs, are a very antient Practice, but I know no Doctrin the Primitive Church had concerning them, but of the Communion of Saints which was both in the Church Militant and Triumphant; and they are ſo far from bordering upon the Roman Doctrin of Purgatory, that they utterly deſtroy it, for they were offered for thoſe who were owned

owned to be in Happiness and could never be supposed to go to Purgatory, to wit, for *Saints* and *Martyrs* and *Apostles*, and even for the *Virgin Mary* her self, as appears by the antient Liturgies. ||

|| Lyturg. Aegyptiac.
Lyturg. Chrysost.

As to *Prayers in an unknown Tongue*, this cannot I hope be said to be the Practice of the Primitive Church, and if the Language of *Rome* had been as unalterable, as she pretends her Faith is, her Prayers had been in a known Tongue now, but I doubt they are both equally changeable.

As to the *Worship of Saints and Angels*, and the offering up Prayers to them and to the *Blessed Virgin*, I shall offer but one Observation out of Antiquity, which does for ever destroy all manner of Worship, of what degree soever, to any but the true God, and that is the Charge of Idolatry, which was laid by all the *Orthodox* Fathers, against the *Arians*, for worshipping and praying to Christ, when they believed him not to be the true God, but only a Creature tho of the most exalted Nature : This does so fully shew the sense of the Church against all Worship, be it of what kind it will, to any Creature; (for it was not the highest and most sovereign Worship which the *Arrians* were supposed or charged to give to Christ) that it is the plainest thing in the World, that there could be no manner of Worship *then* to Saints or Angels or to the Blessed Virgin, as there is now in the Roman Church; But he that will see the clearest Account of Antiquity in this matter, let him consult a most excellent Discourse, concerning the *Worship of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, with an Account of the Beginnings and Rise of it among Christians against Monsieur de Meaux*.

As to the *Worship of Images*, it is too well known at what time and with what opposition that was brought into the Western Church, and how great a Part of it

did then declare against them; so that it was impossible *that* should have been the Doctrine of the Primitive Church, which was with so great a struggle and violence brought into the Roman, at the latter end of the 7th Century: As to the first Ages, it is plain from the Instance of *Epiphanius* and the Council of *Eliberis*, that they would not suffer Images and Pictures in their Churches, and at first hardly thought the very making of them to be lawful, as appears from *Clemens Alexandrinus*.

But I must not insist on *Particulars*, I offer only some few undeniable Breviates of Antiquity, by which it cannot but evidently appear to any ingenuous Man, that these Doctrines of the Roman Church which distinguish it from the Reformed, were not the Doctrines of the Primitive Church, but are plainly and notoriously contrary to the best Antiquity: tho they are very apt to brag of *that* upon all occasions, yet how little they esteem it, and how conscious they are to themselves that it is not for their purpose, and that it is truly against them, I shall by some general Remarks unquestionably demonstrate, and make them, if they have any shame, confess it themselves. And

First, What mean their *Expurgatory Indices*, whereby they have corrected so many Fathers, and blotted out and expunged so many Sentences out of the Writings of the most antient Doctors of the Church, and by new Additions, made them speak contrary to themselves in so many places of their Works, if they were not sensible that those ancient Authors, who bring down to us the Doctrine of the Primitive Church, were in many things Witnesses against them, and bore evident Testimony against their new Opinions? This is so plain a Confession, that Antiquity is against them, and renders them so much self-condemned, that they intended to have kept these

these *Indices* very private, and it was only by chance that we came to the first knowledg of them. Our Learned *James* has acquainted the World with the *Mystery* of them, as he calls it, but it is so plain a Mystery of Iniquity that it needs nothing to discover the Fraud and Villany of it. To raze ancient Records is a Crime of the highest nature; and they who are guilty of it, as the Church of *Rome* is in the greatest degree, by thus purging and correcting the Fathers, by an Inquisition the most cruel of any other, and that appointed by the Council of *Trent*, need no other proof to convict them that that Cause which stands in need of such Arts, is not to be defended without them; and this is such a Note of a Church, that it brands and stigmatizes it with another Mark than that of Antiquity.

2. Besides the correcting, or rather corrupting so many Fathers which were genuine Monuments of Antiquity, the counterfeiting so many false ones, and obtruding so many spurious Authors upon the World, is a plain Evidence of the want of true Antiquity. This is like suborning of Witnesses, which is enough to make all the World suspect that what they are brought for, and what they depose, is not true; it is no other than forging of old Writings and Instruments to help out the known Weakness of a crackt Title. Thus the *Decretal Epistles* were counterfeited, to prop up the Pope's Spiritual Power, and *Constantine's Donation* to establish his Temporal. The Cheat of the first was so evident from the Style, being so sordid and so unlike those Ages, and yet being so like it self in all parts, as shew'd it to have throughout but one Author, that tho they were formerly made use of, and did great Service, yet they are now laid by as too gross to be owned by most of the Learned Men of that Church; and the other, tho it be

still defended by some of them, yet has such marks of Forgery as makes most of them confess it ; but great numbers are there of forged and spurious Authors, whose Testimonies are still produced by these Writers for those Doctrines and Opinions which are destitute of true Antiquity; a Collection of which is given us by our *James* in his *Bastardy of the false Fathers*, and all those Criticks who have wrote Censures upon the Fathers Works cannot but own it. I cannot charge this upon any publick Act of the Church, as that of purging and correcting the Fathers, but most of their Writers who bring such large and false Musters of the Fathers are guilty of it, and particularly some of their late Books amongst us.* We have a very great and early Instance of this notorious way of Forgery in the very Head and Governours of that Church, and that was in falsifying the *Nicene* Canons, and thrusting in a Canon of a particular Synod among those of a General Council, thereby to claim a Power of *Appeals* to themselves, which was such an Imposture as shows what some Men will do to gain Power and Authority over other Churches, and what an unfaithful Preserver a Church may be, that pretends to be infallible, not only of Oral Tradition, but even of Writings too, for they had Copies without question of the Council of *Nice*; and if the other great Churches of *Constantinople*, *Antioch*, and *Alexandria* had not had authentick and agreeing Copies to the contrary, the Churches of *Africa* had been run down by one of the most palpable Forgeries in the World, and the Church of *Rome* would no doubt have made a great deal more use of it afterwards than upon that particular occasion. But,

* Consensus
Veterum Nu-
bes Testium.

3. Tho Antiquity is to be sometimes suppress and stifled that it may say nothing against them, and some-
times

times suborned and counterfeited that it may bear false Witness for them; and tho they generally make a fair show and a great noise with the pretence of it, yet they cannot but often betray the little Esteem and Regard which they have of it; thus, to give an Instance or two, In the famous Question of the Virgin's immaculate Conception, tho the Fathers are acknowledged to be generally against it, and their own Bishop *Canus* † † De Sancto reckons up *St. Ambrose*, *St. Austin*, *St. Chrysostom*, and rum Auctori-
a great many more who expressly assert her being con- tate, l. 7. loc.
ceived in Original Sin, and says, *that this is the unani- Theolog. c. 1.*
mous Opinion of all the Fathers who happen *Lozan.*

to make mention of it (a) yet he declares this to be a very weak and infirm Argument which is drawn from the Authority of all the Fathers, and that notwithstanding that the contrary Opinion is piously and probably maintained and defended in the Church (b), and Bellarmine says (c) they are not to be reckoned among Catholics, who are of another Opinion, tho it be contrary it seems to all Antiquity. Thus at other times Bellarmine shifts off the Authority of St. Cyprian,

when he plainly opposes that of the Pope, and says, that he mortally erred and offended in so doing (d); and concerning Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and others, their Opinion, he says, cannot be defended from great Error (e), when it is against his own; thus also of St. Hierom, he was of that Opinion, but it is false and it shall be refuted (f). And to mention no more, tho they stick not upon all occasions to slight and condemn Antiquity when it will not make for them, Baronius, one of their greatest

(a) Sancti namque omnes, qui in ejus rei mentionem incidere, uno ore asseuerarunt, beatam Virginem in Peccato originali conceptam; hoc vid. *Ambr.* hoc *August.* hoc *Chrysost.* &c. Ib. (b) Infirmum tamen omnium autoritate argumentum ducitur, quin potius contraria sententia & probabiliter & piè in Ecclesiâ defenditur. Ib. (c) Inter Catholicos non sunt numerandi. *Bellarmin.* de Amis. grat. l. 4. c. 15.

(d) Videtur mortaliter peccasse. *Bellarmin.* l. 4. de Romano Pontifico, c. 7. (e) Eorum sententiam non video quo pacto ab errore possumus defendere.

Bellarmin. de beat. §. 1. l. c. 6. (f) Videtur Hieronymus in ea sententiâ fuisse sed falsa est & suo loco refellenda. *Bellarmin.* de Pontif. Rom. l. 1. c. 8.

Searchers into Antiquity, but as great a Corrupter of it, who had taken that Oath, I suppose, prescribed by Pope *Pius 4th*, not to receive or expound Scripture but according to the uniform Consent of the Fathers, yet doth unwarily, but ingenuously confess, that *the holy Fathers, whom for their great Learning we justly call the Doctors of the Church, yet the Catholick* (that is, Roman) *Church doth not always follow, nor in all things, the Interpretation of Scripture.* * They can go off it seems from their Oath, and from the Fathers too, when they think fit; and they are not always bound to keep so close to Antiquity, as they give out at other times, and pretend they do. But in the last place;

* Nam sanctissimos Patres, quos Doctores Ecclesie ob illorum sublimem eruditionem merito nominamus, in Interpretatione Scripturarum non semper ac in omnibus Catholica Ecclesia sequitur. Baron. Annal. Eccles. an. 34. n. 213. p. 238. *Colon.*

4. The Determinations and Decrees of the present Church are the only things they stick to, and 'tis the Authority and Infallibility of that which they rely more upon, and a thousand times more regard than all Antiquity, or the whole Sense of the Primitive Church. They pretend indeed not to determine any thing contrary either to Scripture, or to the Primitive Church, but they make themselves the only Judges of both; they tell us they make no new Doctrines, nor no Innovations in Faith, but they keep to themselves the Power of declaring what Doctrines are new, and what are not; and then I can see little difference between their *making*, and their *declaring* new Articles of Faith, since 'tis their declaring makes them to be believed and received as *such*, when they were not to be so before: and how then does that differ from *making* them Articles of Faith? *Bellarmino* speaks plainly out, tho against his own Note, when he says, *The Church of latter time hath Power not only to explain and declare, but constitute*

tute and command those things which belong to Faith †. If the present Church has a Power to make more Doctrines and Articles, be believed as necessary to Salvation than were believed by the Primitive Church; then it may make Additions to the Christian Faith, and make that necessary to be believed at one time, which was not at another: if it has not this Power, let them declare it, and not count others Hereticks who receive all the ancient Creeds, and hold the Faith of all the ancient Councils, and believe all those Doctrines that the whole Primitive Church, in all Places, and at all times, ever held. Here with *Lyrinensis*, we fix and set our Feet, and here we resolve to stand and keep our Ground, and not be moved with every Wind of Doctrine that shall blow out of a new Quarter, and that a small part of the present Church shall declare to be an Article of Faith, when It was never so declared by the Primitive. To say that they have made no new Articles of Faith in their Church, but only the same Articles made *Explicit*, which were *Implicit* before in the Primitive Church, is as if they should say, there are no new Men in the World since *Adam* or *Noah*, but only the same Men that were before Implicit in their Loyns, are now explicitly born into the World. Thus the Church, tho it be never so fruitful in producing Doctrines and Articles of Faith that never were before in the Church, yet makes nothing new; and however spurious its Doctrines may be, and however degenerating from the Faith of our Forefathers, yet it must be said to be of the same Kind and Species. Faith, it seems, in the Primitive Church, was but an Embrio, or like a small Seed or Kernel, implicitly containing all the Parts entire, but in little; but when it is grown up and enlarged by the explicit Declaration of the Church, then it may swell into a mighty bigness, and increase even

† Traët. de
poteft. Sum.
Pontif.

even into the largest *Tridentine* Bulk, and be it never so unlike the former, yet it must be called the same still. But if this implicit Faith was sufficient for the Primitive Church, why may it not be so for the present, and what need have we of a more explicit Faith to save us now, than they had to save them then? All the essential Articles of Christian Faith are to be explicitly believed at all times, and 'tis strange that we must be now obliged to a more *explicit* Faith, and a more *implicit* Obedience than the Primitive Church was ever acquainted with: But after all, I hope those Doctrines that are *contrary* to the Doctrines of the Primitive Church, were not then implicitly believed by it; and if they were not, I am sure most of the Doctrines of the Roman Church, as different from the Reformed, were not her implicit Doctrines: but unless Error may be folded up with Truth, and one part of a Contradiction may be involved in the other, the late Corruptions and Decrees of the Roman Church, in her *Trent* Articles, were no way contained in the quite different Doctrines of the Primitive Church. And thus, because I have gone too far with this Discourse, I must abruptly take leave of *Bellarmin*, and his Church, tho I resolve, by God's Grace, to keep always to this his true Note of the Church, and therefore to that Church in which I am, which is the most agreeable to the Primitive of any in the World, both as to Doctrine and every thing else.

T H E E N D.

L O N D O N,

Printed by J. D. for Richard Chiswel at the Rose and Crown in
St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1687.

The Seventh Note of the CHURCH EXAMINED,

VIZ,

*The Union of the Members among
themselves, and with the Head.*

*Septima Nota est Unio membrorum cum Capite, inter se & cum Capite.
Bellar. L. iv. c. 10. de Notis Ecclesiæ.*

I M P R I M A T U R.

May 26. 1687.

Guil. Needham.

THE Church as the Cardinal observes, is called in the Scriptures, *one Body, one Spouse, one Sheepfold*: But he that infers from hence, that Unity is a proper Mark of the True Church, ought to be very well assured that the *Head* and *Members* are united no-where but in the *Body* of *Christ*, and that the Harlot cannot be *One* as well as the Spouse, &c. But the World has hitherto been persuaded that bare Unity is a Character to be found upon Societies of different Natures and contrary Designs; that of it self it infers neither Good nor Evil, and may belong to a Body of Rebels, no less than to an Army of Loyal Subjects. Unity is then indeed a good Mark, when 'tis a Duty; as 'tis a Duty when the Terms of Union are so. For which Reason the Union of the Church is of all others

T

the

the most excellent, because all Men ought to follow that Truth and Goodness which are necessary to Salvation ; and these are best preserved and maintained by Union among those who follow them : For which Reasons also 'tis celebrated in the Gospel with variety of Expressions. But to argue from hence that the Union of Members among Themselves, and with their Head, is a proper Note of the true Church, is just as if I should conclude upon seeing a thousand Men marching in good Order, and with equal Pace after their Leader, that therefore of necessity they must be going to *York*.

Notwithstanding therefore this Argument from *Unity* being attributed to the Church, the Cardinal did not think fit to leave his Mark so very loose and common, but slips into the mention of those things wherein the Unity of the Church consists, as he pretends. He tells us, that the Head with which the Members are united is the *Pope*. And as for their Union among themselves, he afterwards proves that all Catholicks must needs agree in all Points of Faith, *since they all submit their own Sense to the Sense of one and the same chief Pastor, guiding the Church from the Chair of Peter, with the advice of other Pastors*. So that now we know what he means by the Union of the Members to their Head, and among themselves ; that is to say, the Union of the Members of the *Roman Church* to the *Pope* as to their Head, and their Union among themselves in believing all that he teaches from the *Chair of St. Peter*, &c.

Which Note does for its part make good what was observed at first, concerning the general Design of these *Notes*, which is not so much to describe to us the proper Characters of a true Christian Church, as to prove that the Church of *Rome* is the only True Church. Whatever the Cardinal insinuated at first, he seemed to be ve-

ry sensible, that the Union of Members with the Head, and among themselves, was too large a Note to fit no other Society but a true Christian Church. Now if in restraining his Note he had understood *Christ* by the Head; and by the Union of the Members to one another, an Agreement in the Faith that was once delivered to the Saints; this indeed would have served for the finding out of a True Church; but then this was too large for the Cardinal's Purpose, which was to find no other Church to be True but the *Roman*. And therefore by the *Head* it was necessary to understand the Pope, and by the Union of the Members, an Agreement in all that Doctrine which is taught by the *Roman* Church. For it was to be hoped that this would mark all the *Roman* Communion *in*, but it would most undoubtedly mark all other Christians *out* of the only true Church. For this is the admirable reasoning to which it leads: That is the true Church which acknowledges the Pope for its Head, and for its Faith professes the Doctrine, whatever it be, that is taught in the Church of *Rome*. And from hence it must needs follow, that the Church of *Rome* is the only True Church. *Quod erat demonstrandum.*

And if the Cardinal had left the Matter thus in short, he had in my mind done better for his Church, and his reasoning had been less exceptionable than he has made it in the pursuance of his Enlargements. When a Man has to do with an untractable piece of Matter, it often happens that the more he strives to fashion it to his own Purpose, the farther he is from it. And so this great Man by labouring over-much to make this his Mark of Unity utterly unserviceable to any other Church, has given it that Figure at last, which makes it unfit for his own, as we shall see in convenient place.

For I shall endeavour to make out these three things.

- I. That the Unity here offer'd is no true Note of the Church.
- II. That if it were; yet the *Roman Church* has it not.
- III. That that Unity which is indeed a Note of the Church we have, and that in a much greater degree than they.

I. That *the Unity here offered is no true Note of the Church*; which I shall shew concerning both his Instances of it.

And *First, Concerning Union with the Pope as Head of the Church*: That this should be a Note of the Church, is a pretence that hath neither Scripture, Reason, nor Antiquity for it, but all against it.

1. For *Scripture*; the Cardinal offers not any proof from thence of his Presumption, which yet had been very requisite to a point of so vast a Consequence, if the Scripture had afforded any Testimony to his purpose.

That the Pope should be the Head of the Church and the Center of its Unity, that Union to him should be an essential Character of the Church, and the very Being of it depend upon him: But that the Scripture should not give us the least intimation of it, is a thing so perfectly unaccountable, that the very silence of the Scripture in a matter of this high nature, is to us a sufficient Argument, that the Apostles knew nothing of any such Constitution.

Especially, since they did not forget to make plain and frequent mention of another Head of the Church, to which all the Members are to be united, *viz.* our Lord

Lord Jesus Christ. They tell us, That *when God raised him from the dead, he gave him to be HEAD over all things to the Church, which is HIS BODY.* That *as there are many Members in one Body; so we being many, are ONE BODY IN CHRIST.* That *as the Body is one and hath many Members — so also is CHRIST,* i. e. Christ and the Church, the whole being denominated from the Head, for we are *the BODY OF CHRIST.* We are told, That *he is the Head, even Christ, from whom the whole Body is fitly joyned together &c.* That he is *the Head of the Church; and the Saviour of the Body:* That he *is the Head of the Body the Church.* And much more to this purpose might be added. Now when the Church is so frequently declared to be one Body, and to this one Body, one Head is so frequently assigned and no more: What can any Man who is not possessed with prejudice, make of this, but that there is no other Head of the Church besides him who is so often mentioned as such, and that by the same Reason that any Man goes about to add another Head to the Church, he might if he pleased find out another Church for the Head? Nor does it help at all that they pretend the Pope to be but the *Vicarious* and *Ministerial* Head of the Church, since if without Union to him we are out of the Church, and have no part in Christ, it was necessary that this pretended *Vicarious* Head should have been as plainly and frequently expressed, as we know the True and Real Head to have been.

Nay, it was something more necessary; since a very slender intimation might have been sufficient to assure us that he who *is the Image of the Invisible God, by whom all things were created, and by whom all things consist, is also the Head of the Body the Church:* That he *in whom we have redemption through his Blood, who is the Saviour of the*

Eph. i. 20, 22, 23.

Rom. xii. 4, 5.

1 Cor. xii. 12, 27.

Eph. iv. 16.

Verf. 23.

Col. i. 18.

Col. i. 15, 18.

Ver. 14.

the

the Body, and for our sakes humbled himself to the Death of the Cross, should be also *the Head of the Body*, and be exalted to be *Head* over all things *unto his Church*; He I say in whom infinite Power and Goodness met. But that there should be another Head given to the whole Church, to be united to which, was no less necessary than Union to *Christ* himself. And that this Catholick Head should be no other than a sinful Man, and he very often none of the best; this was so far removed from self-Evidence or even Probability, that it certainly needed very express mention, if not frequent inculcation. Now that he should be frequently mentioned as Head of the Church, who in comparison needed not to be mentioned at all; And that no mention at all should be made of another Head of the Church that needs it very much, is for them to give an account of who make Union to this later Head no less necessary to a Part in the Body of *Christ*, than Union to the former.

Which account will be much harder to be given, inasmuch as there is no mention at all of this pretended Head, where there was the most fair and inviting occasion for it, that can be well imagined. Thus *St. Paul* shewing what Gifts *Christ* bestowed upon his Church after his Ascension, saith; *He gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Evangelists, and some Pastors and Teachers—for the edifying of the Body of Christ—and that we might grow up into him in all things, which is the Head even Christ.* Now here we do not only find our Saviour represented as the Head of his Church, and we as the Members of his Body, but that amongst the several subordinate Members of which his Body consists, there is no mention of that most necessary Member of all, (if I may call it a Member) the Vicarious Head

Eph. iv. 11,
12, &c.

Head of the Church. For it is not said that he gave first *Peter* to be Head of his Church, and then Apostles, &c. But he gave, first, some Apostles, and those not as Heads of his Church neither, but as principal Members of it. And in the Beginning of the same Chapter, where he describes the Unity of the Church, he says, there is *one Body and one Spirit, one Hope of our Calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all.*

Now I would fain know whether the Cardinal would have omitted here, *one visible Head of the Church, in which all ought to be united*: And then let any Man tell me why *St. Paul* did. He had the like occasion in another Place, where having said much concerning the Unity of the Body of *Christ*; *Ye are, saith he, the Body of Christ, and Members in particular; And God hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, secondly Prophets, thirdly Teachers* &c. I Cor. xii. 27, 28. Now I say, if this visible Head of Unity had been elsewhere mentioned never so often, he ought not to have been omitted in any of these three places; much less if he were mentioned no where else. But no notice being taken of this Head elsewhere, nor here neither, is little less than a Demonstration that that there was no such Head to be taken notice of.

When any one shall pretend to so high a Prerogative and vast a Dependence as this implies, we may in Reason expect he should be able to produce some very good Evidence of his Right to it. And therefore the meer silence of the Scripture is prejudice enough against the Pretence. But the silence of the Scripture, in such places as I have produced, is a direct Argument against it.

Nay, Lastly, The Scripture is so far from giving the least intimation of any such *Headship*, where the mention of it was unavoidable, if it had been a Divine Constitution;

tution ; that it seems expressly to oppose it. For *St. Paul* speaking against those Contentions which happened, by one saying I am of *Paul*, another I am of *Apollos*, a third, I am of *Cephas*, he does not oppose *Cephas* or *Peter* to the rest, as if it were lawful for them to say, I am of *Peter*, but not, I am of *Paul*, &c. but utterly reproves all such Distinctions, and requires them all to be united in *Christ*. *Is Christ divided ?* says he, *Was Paul Crucified for you ? Or, were ye Baptized in the Name of Paul ?* Plainly shewing that to establish any mortal Man as the Center of Union in the *Christian Church*, is in effect to divide the Authority of *Christ* ; and that if we unite our selves in such a Head, we may as well be baptized in his Name, and have him for our Saviour too.

2. As little Foundation is there in Reason for this Headship of the Pope over the whole Body of *Christ* ; since it will necessarily require that all the Christian Churches in the World, even those that are at greatest Distance from one another, be reduced under his Government, and depend upon his Authority ; the Administration of which vast Power and Trust is incompatible to any mortal Man. Being vested in a wise and good Man, it could be but of little benefit to a Body so diffusive as the *Catholick Church* ; but in the Hands of a weak or vicious Person, it would become the Instrument of Pride, Tyranny, Oppression, and Divisions. A small Bishoprick requires the utmost Care and Prudence to manage it aright ; but what Ability, without a Miracle, could be sufficient for a tolerable discharge of so great a Trust, as the Inspection and Government of the whole Church from one end of the Earth to the other ? But the Temptations to abuse such Power would be infinite, and the Abuses themselves intolerable, and hardly capable of Redress ; as we see also by no small Experience. For
after

after that that Power was pretended to at *Rome*, and submitted to by the *Western Church*; the Scandals & Miseries of this part of *Christendom* grew to such an Extremity, that it could not be dissembled. Inſomuch that the Cardinals and Prelats appointed by Pope *Paul* the Third, to adviſe concerning the ſtate of the Church, aſſured him that ſhe *was juſt falling head-long into Ruine*; and that the chief Cauſe was, that the Pope's Will and Pleaſure had been the Rule of all his Doings. And he that ſhall conſider what a lewd and filthy place *Rome* it ſelf was grown, by their own confeſſion, may obſerve from thence how likely it is that the Government of the Catholick Church ſhould thrive in one Man's hand after another, who are too buſy to attend upon the Reformation of moſt ſcandalous and crying Diſorders at home.

Conſil. de
Emend. Eccl.
in Richer. l. 4.

3. Neither is there any colour in Antiquity for this Headſhip of the Pope; altho they are the Primitive Fathers upon whoſe Authority chiefly they would ſupport this Uſurpation. The Teſtimonies which the Cardinal has choſen for his Purpoſe, are ſo far from it, that one would wonder to ſee ſo weighty a Superſtructure laid upon ſo weak a Foundation. Thus, becauſe *S. Irenæus* ſays that *every Church, i. e. the Faithful who are all about, muſt needs reſort to the Roman Church, becauſe of the more Powerful Principality; i. e. becauſe the Imperial City drew the Buſineſs of the World to it ſelf, and by conſequence Chriſtians in all parts had occaſion of reſort to it; therefore the Biſhop of that City was the Head of all Churches in the World.* Becauſe *S. Cyprian* call'd the *Roman the Principal Church, from whence the Unity of the Priests did ariſe, and the Matrix and Root of the Catholick Church*: Therefore he could mean nothing elſe, but that Union to the Biſhop of *Rome* is abſolutely

necessary to a part in Christ and his Church: Whereas it is most evident, that elsewhere he did freely assert the Independence of other Bishops upon that Bishop, and of other Episcopal Churches upon that Church: And consequently that he called it the *Principal Church*, as being constituted in the Principal City, (so *Rigaltius* acknowledgeth); and the Spring of *Sacerdotal Unity*, and the Root of the *Catholick Church*, because Bishops having occasion either to come up to *Rome*, or to send thither from all parts, did by their Unity with the Church there, manifestly declare their Union to one another, which was a convenience accruing to that Church (and to all others) from the Imperial City in which it was constituted; but by no means inferring that other Churches were more obliged to Union with her, than she with others. Again, because it was sometimes a Mark of an Orthodox and Catholick Christian to be joyn'd in Communion with the *Roman Bishop*; therefore it must always be so, and it can never happen that a Man should be united to the Church, and disjoyn'd from the Pope. Because St. *Hierom* referred himself to the Chair of *Peter* when *Damasus* sat in it; therefore he would have done the same to his Predecessor *Liberius*, after he had communicated with the *Arians*. Of the same kind is the Argument from *Optatus*. Finally, because St. *Augustin* thought that *Cecilian* had reason to value his Communion with the *Roman Church*, more than the multitude of his Enemies, in as much as the *Principality of an Apostolical Chair* had always flourished there; therefore the Bishop of *Rome* is Head of the Church: As if there were no other Apostolical Chair besides that at *Rome*; and as if the Communion of no other Church was to be esteemed, when a Bishop meets with unreasonable Opposition, but one that is by virtue of her Chair Mistress

of all the Rest. For what he says out of *St. Augustin in Psal. contra partem Donati*, it has had its Answer p. 107. Pope *Leo* indeed speaks a little more to the Purpose, but without any Authority, as being a Witness in his own Cause. For it was but a few Years before, that *Zosimus*, *Boniface* and *Celestin* had set up a small pretence to an Universal Headship, tho nothing was got by it, but a notable Rebuke from the *African* Fathers, whereof *St. Augustin* was one, for introducing a worldly Pride into the Church. But no wonder if those Popes that followed, still kept their Eye upon that Power which their Predecessors could not as yet compass.

On the other side it appears by most unquestionable Evidence, that the Primitive Fathers knew no greater necessity of being united to the Roman, than to any other Catholick or Orthodox Bishop. When Pope *Victor* took upon him to excommunicate the *Arian* Churches, for not observing *Easter* as the *Roman* did, they were so far from thinking a Union with him as their Head necessary to their being Members of the Catholick Church, that they called a Synod of their own, reprehended the Pope's Arrogance, and resolved to adhere to their own Custom. *St. Cyprian*, *Firmilian* and the *Africans* did the like, in opposition to Pope *Stephen*; *Firmilian* plainly telling him, that while he thought to Excommunicate all them from himself, he had but excommunicated himself from them. In ancient Times there was no shadow of any such Headship in the Pope, as of late Ages has been contended for. He was treated with no other Titles of Respect than other Bishops were, who were called Popes and Vicars of Christ no less than he, as he was by them stiled their Colleague and Brother, no less than they by him. In respect of Presidency over particular Churches, his Jurisdiction was confined as well as theirs,

theirs: in respect of the common Care of the *whole Church*, each of them was deemed to have an Authority and a Trust no way inferiour to his: All which our Adversaries do full well understand, who are but a little conversant in *St. Cyprian*, if they would but speak what they know. But because *St. Hieron's* Complaint to *Damasus* is insisted upon by the Cardinal; let *St. Hieron* be heard speaking to this very Point so clearly, that we cannot desire he should have been more express; "Where-ever, saith he, there is a Bishop, whether at " *Rome*, or at *Eugubium*, or *Constantinople*, or *Rhegium*, " or *Alexandria*, or *Thanis*; he is of the same Worth, " and of the same Priesthood. The advantage of Wealth, " and the disadvantage of Poverty, does not make a Bishop to be higher or lower; but they are all Successors " of the Apostles. To conclude this Point, Popes have been anciently censured, condemned and excommunicated, when they were thought to have deserved it. *Julius* was Excommunicated by the Eastern Bishops; *Libertinus* Anathematized by *St. Hilary*; *Vigilius* Excommunicated by the *Africans*; *Honorius* Condemned by the VIth General Council. Did these Fathers take the Pope for their Common Head, and the Center of Catholick Union?

Hier. ad Evagr.
Ep. 85.

See Vindic. of
Answ. to some
late Papers, p.
6. c. 6.

Some Popes have been Hereticks, as the *Romanists* themselves cannot deny; and therefore time has been when it was so far from being a Note of the Catholick Church to be united to the Pope, that it was impossible so to be without separation from the Catholick Church.

But the Cardinal has a very notable Argument to prove the necessity of this Union, viz. *Experience*; since those Churches have withered away, that are divided from this Head the Pope: Witness the *Asiatick* and *African* Churches, anciently famous for numerous Councils,

cils, for *learned* and *holy* Men, but since their Schism from the *Roman Church*, reduced to obscurity, and plunged into gross Ignorance.

To which it might be enough to answer, That although where the Sin is flagrant and beyond controversy, there the Calamity that befalls the Offender may without breach of Charity, or impious Intrusion into the Councils of Providence, be well deemed the effect of God's Justice: Yet in a Dispute about Right and Truth, to take advantage from the Afflictions of a Man, or of a Church, and to make them an Argument against the oppressed side, is barbarously uncharitable and wicked, and becomes none but those who care not by what means they come to their end.

But not to pry into the Secrets of Divine Providence; Might it not have served the Cardinal's turn to assign the Afflictions and Ignorance of those Churches to the Irruptions of their Enemies upon them, who at length prevailed, and utterly destroyed some of them, and to this day hold the rest in Slavery? If this be not enough; what if one should add, that their not uniting themselves to the Pope was indeed one cause of their Misfortunes, who had much rather see those ancient and glorious Churches laid waste by Infidels, then saved by the united Arms of *Christendom*, to make a vigorous Opposition to his claim of Supremacy?

However, it is not more certain that they were once the most flourishing Churches in *Christendom*, than that when they were so, they did not acknowledge this Union to the Bishop of *Rome* as the Head of the Catholick Church; nay that they opposed the Beginnings and Preparations to so unjust a claim; and therefore their denying it at present can with no reason be alledged as the cause of their Distress.

One thing more we have to say to this doughty Argument ; that if it may be trusted, how comes it to pass that we have a contrary experience in Churches nearer home, which have not fallen into decay, by separating from the Pope? We are apt to think that from the Reformation to this day, there have been as many Persons eminent both for Piety and Learning in the Church of *England*, as any Age ever produced in any Nation. That we are not sunk into *gross Ignorance*, our Adversaries know by some *Experience*. And we may say, without need of blushing for the matter, that they have felt some Learning from this Church, which their Union to the Pope hath of late helped very few of them to.

And if we may conclude any thing from the Examples of those within their own Communion, we shall find that the more closely any of them are united to this supposed Head, their Piety and Learning does not flourish one jot the more for it. Let the Learning of the *Gallican Church* be compared with that of *Spain* or *Italy*; Let the Piety of the Regulars, especially of the Jesuits, be weighed with that of the Secular Clergy; and I believe it will appear that this Union is no such excellent advantage either towards Piety or Learning, that they should appeal to Experience to shew the Necessity thereof either to the one or the other. And thus much for their Union to the Pope.

2. Neither is the Union which they pretend to among themselves, as *Members*, any certain Note of the Church.

The Cardinal was not content to describe their Union, by *thinking the same concerning all Doctrines of Faith*; but will have it to exclude also Discord, and Dissension, and falling into Sects and Parties. For since he denies such Union to be found amongst *Pagans* and *Heretics*,

ticks, he must be supposed to affirm it of the Members of his Church, if he talks to any purpose. Now admitting it were so:

1. This is no more than what any Society may have as well as the true Church; and any other Church as well as the *Roman*. The Members of every Church are thus far united, that they all agree in professing the common Belief of the Society to which they belong. But about other Doctrine they either fall into Dissension, or not, as it happens. And for some considerable time, they may agree very well, and at length fall out. In which case, according to *Bellarmin's* Note, they would be the true Church while they agreed, whatever their Faith should be, which is most absurd. It is not whether Men are united among themselves in what they believe, but whether that wherein they are united be the right Faith, that is to be considered. Union in a false way is a confederacy in Error; and the more that Men are united in it, the more wise or prudent they may shew themselves to be, but never the more Orthodox. And though the Cardinal produces that Saying of our Saviour; *Every Kingdom divided against it self, is brought to desolation*; to shew that Discord is a Sign of the Kingdom of the Devil; yet he has manifestly perverted the Place, inasmuch as our Saviour's Discourse there proceeds upon the contrary supposition, *viz. that Satan is not divided against himself*.

Matth. xii.

2. As there may be this Union out of the true Church, so it may not be within it; which makes it plain that this is no certain Note of the Church. It is undeniable that there were Divisions in the first Apostolical Churches; and consequently that to be Members of the Catholic Church, it is sufficient that in those things wherein the Unity of the Faith consists, all speak the same thing.

And

And if the Cardinal meant that the breaking of a Church into Parties, and the Rise of Heresies and Schisms out of it, is a certain Note of a false Church; he might as well have said that there never was a true Church in the World, no not in the Apostles times. And if for this Reason he would unchurch the Protestants, he did in effect put as good an Argument, as this against the Reformation, into the Mouth of a *Turk* or a *Jew* against Christianity, that there is no Truth in it at all; and because Christians are so divided one against another, therefore none of them are in the right. For a more particular Consideration of this Argument, I refer the Reader to the *Apologetical Vindication of the Church of England*, lately published.

Thus much for the first part of this Discourse, which was to shew, that the Unity here offered, is not a Note of the Church. I proceed to shew,

II. *That if it were, yet the Roman Church has it not.*
Which is probably true of the First, and most certainly true of the second Branch of the Cardinal's Unity.

I. It is probable that the Roman Church wants the First; and that there is now no true Pope, nor has been for many Ages, for that Church to be united to. For by their own Confession, a Pope *Simoniacally* chosen, a Pope intruded by Violence, a Heretick, and therefore sure an Atheist or an Infidel, is no true Pope. And many such there have been of one sort or other; whose Acts therefore in creating Cardinals, &c. being invalid, it is exceeding probable that the whole Succession has upon this account failed long ago. Besides, there have been about 25 Schisms in the Church of *Rome*, the last of

of which continued no less than 50 Years, wherein two, and sometimes three Popes pretended to *St. Peter's* Chair, created Cardinals, had their several Parties and Abettors, &c. During which Schisms, it would be a madness to say that the *Roman* Church was united to the Pope, as Head, when they were all together by the Ears, which of the Anti-Popes was the true one? Now while there was no certain Pope, there could be no certainty of the validity of any Acts necessary to continue a Succession of true Popes. But this Case having happen'd so often, and sometimes continued for many years, the uncertainty must have at last grown into an utter improbability that they have a Pope, and therefore (according to the Cardinal) that they are a Church; unless it be all one whether the Church be united with a Nominal Pope, or a Real Pope; with a True Head, or a False Head, or any Head whatsoever. But,

2. It is undoubtedly true, That the *Roman* Church has not the second Branch of Unity, *viz.* that Union of the Members to one another, which the Cardinal pretends. Whether by it he means an Union in all points of Doctrine of great Consequence, amongst those who remain in the Communion of his pretended Catholick Church; or such an Union of their Members as shall prevent the breaking away of some from the Communion of the rest.

She has not the former Unity. For if *Philosophers, Hereticks, &c.* have had their *Sects* and *Parties*, and been at great Diffensions among themselves; so have the Members of the *Roman* Church too.

He pretends that all the *Sacred Writers of their Church* do wonderfully agree. Now to let pass his Presumption, in supposing the ancient Doctors of the Church to be one part of these their Writers, we will for the present

admit it, and only ask, If they agreed so wonderfully with the Fathers, what need there was of an *Index Expurgatorius* upon the Fathers to make them and the Fathers of *Trent* agree something better?

He pretends that the Decrees of their *Lawful* Councils agree in * *all Doctrines*. Just so the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil* decreeing, That all Power, even the *Papal*, was in things appertaining to Religion, to be subject to the Council; agreed with the Abolition of the *Pragmatick* Sanction, by the *Lateran* Council, under *Leo X*, by which the Council is made to truckle to the Pope. As to which, and other Instances of the like sort, no help is to be had from that Qualification of *Lawful* Councils; since what the *Jesuits* will not own to be a *Lawful* Council, is by other Parties in that Church owned to be so. And that Church must needs be at wonderful Unity within it self, that cannot so much as agree what Councils are *Lawful*, and what are not. And yet if they were so agreed, their Church-Unity is not to be bragged of, when there are enough amongst them to make an unlawful Council, and to determin otherwise in a point of so vast Consequence, as that above-mentioned, than they ought to do. For if in the same Communion, one Council determines one way, and another the contrary way, that Communion cannot be said to agree ever the more, for one being a lawful and the other an unlawful Council.

Whereas he pretends that the Decrees of Popes are also at Unity with one another, one would expect that in the next place Fire and Water should be brought in for an Example of Agreement too: For they may be made to agree, as soon as the Decrees of many Popes. *Leo* and *Gelasius* condemned receiving in one kind; Have there been no Popes since that condemned the contrary?

De Consecr.
Dist. 2. cap. 12.

Nicholas IV determined that *Christ* was a Beggar, and had Right to nothing; but *John* XXII comes not long after him, and makes it Heretical so to say. It has been so frequent a practice for Popes to overthrow the Decrees of their Predecessors, that it were endless to recount the particulars.

Extravag. Joh.
Tit. 14. cap. 4.

As for the Writers which they may justly claim to themselves; how *Bellarmin* should come to fancy such a wonderful Agreement, is very strange, who in his own Controversies has observed so many notable Differences amongst them. Was it not *Bellarmin* that observed several Catholick Writers to have agreed with the Hereticks, in asserting the Council to be above the Pope? and that as those did not agree with themselves, so neither did the other side of Canonists and School-men that asserted the contrary? And this is no trifling Question neither. Such Disagreement is noted by the same Cardinal upon other material Points, *viz.* Concerning the Pope's Temporal Power; Whether Vows of single Life are dispensable? What Worship may be given to Images? Whether Images of God may be made or not? Whether Extream Unction, and other of their Sacraments were instituted by *Christ*? Whether Intention be necessary to a Sacrament? Whether an express purpose of forsaking Sin be necessary to Contrition? Whether good Works be truly meritorious? And concerning many more Questions, in most of which, some or other of themselves have held as Protestants do, against the rest of their Church.

De Concil.
lib. 2. cap. 14.
& alibi.

Not to insist upon the Disputes between the *Thomists*, the *Scotists* and the *Occamists*, which were not all about Trifles; the Question between the *Dominicans* and *Franciscans*, about the Conception of the Virgin, was by themselves esteemed of such Consequence, that there have been Revelations about it against Revelations, and

See *Veteres*
Vindicat. c. 10.

See *Defence of*
Exp. of the Do-
ctrine of the Ch.
of England.
p. 90.

if we will believe them, Miracles against Miracles: To which we may add the flaming Contentions between the *Jansenists* and the *Molinists*; both which grew to such a height, that it has been all along almost as dangerous to the Interest of the *Roman* Church to let their Controversies go on, as to go about to decide them. I confess the Divinity of the New Methodists, the *French* Expositor, and the *English* Representer, has as yet occasioned but little disturbance in that Communion, for which I know a good Reason. But this I will say, that if their New-Popery can in all Points be received with the Old, I do not see but from this time forward their Unity may be inviolable, now that they have got the Knack of making Contradictions agree with one another.

But to all such Instances as these *Bellarmino* hath supplied them with a ready Answer; That *they differ not in those things that belong to Faith*. Upon which cautious Answer, one would be apt to enquire how nearly a Question in Religion must be allied to the *Faith*, before it may be said to *belong to it*.

The Cardinal himself tells us now and then of something held by Catholics that is *vere hereticum*, as he calls it, *almost heretical*, in which case the Question should be also *almost of Faith*, and may be said to *belong to it*. But if he means simply that *they all agree in Matters of Faith*, as he says afterward; and that *all Catholics say the same thing about Doctrines of Faith*, as we were told before; we are willing to hear him. But then we expect that the Church of *England*, the *Lutherans* and the *Calvinists* should be heard too, when to the Papists charging them with some *Differences*, they make the same Answer, that they have all the same *Faith*; especially since when they come to prove the Truth of what they say,

say, they will shew that the Matters wherein they differ do not break the Unity of the Catholick Faith: which is something a better Argument than the Cardinal produces for the Unity of his Party in matters of Faith, *viz.* that they all *profess to believe that which shall be judged necessary to be believed in the Roman Catholick Church.* For to say no more to this at present; notwithstanding this Profession, we are very sure that some of them take those things to be matters of Faith, which others do not, if we may believe them; of which the *Infallibility of the Pope*, and the *Deposing Doctrine* are notorious and undeniable Instances.

But now, if by the *Union of the Members*, should be meant such a Union as will hinder the separation of some from the rest; then this Note must not by any means be pretended to in the Church of *Rome*, from which so many Churches that once were in Communion with her, have broken away. Indeed he does not expressly say that he means this by the Union of the Members among themselves; but some such thing he must mean, or else by virtue of this Note he does impertinently run down the *Lutherans* as being Hereticks, because they have begotten so many Sects, which, as he pretends, charge each other with *Herefy*. And then it may as truly be said that the Church of *Rome*, in whose Communion we were before the Reformation, wants the Mark of Unity, because so many have broken away from her; as that any other Churches want it, because some have also divided from them. For 'tis very idle to say, that tho we were Members of that Church when we first began to differ from it, yet that by our Divisions we cut ourselves from her Communion, and therefore that the Unity of her Communion is not affected by our Departure. For thus we may as well excuse all the separations
from

from ours or from any other Church, *viz.* that by separating from us, they no longer belong to us. We are very confident that in all Points of Doctrine of any great moment, we of the Church of *England* do agree much more together, than those of the Church of *Rome*; and as for them who have gone out from us, they as little break the Unity of the rest whom they are gone from, as *Luther's* departing from the Church of *Rome*, broke the Unity of those who still remained in it. So that either the Church of *Rome* must renounce her pretence to Unity upon this account, that Sects and Parties have not broken away from her; or she must set up this wise Note of the true Church, that all her Members are united, except those that are divided from her; which is a Mark that will fit any Society in the World.

But the Cardinal does here offer a difference between the Division of Hereticks from the Church, and a Division from Heresy; "That in their Church they have "a certain Rule for ending Controversies, *viz.* the Sentence of the chief Pastor, or the Definition of a general "Council; and therefore Dissension does not arise among "them from the Doctrine of the Church, but from the "Malice of the Devil.

Now in answer to this, not to be importunate with that Question, That if these be the ways of compounding Controversies, how comes it to pass that their Controversies still remain? I would know,

(1.) Why were not these the means of composing those Controversies that carried us away from them? Our Fathers were once of their Communion, and those means were not sufficient to retain them in it. To say this *arose from the Malice of the Devil*, is to say in effect that the Devil was in 'em; which is a little too Magisterial for a Controvertist though he were a Cardinal.

Un-

Unless he resolves to ascribe it to the Devil that they were taken off from an implicit Faith and a blind Obedience to the Church of *Rome*: For it seems to be some Peoples Opinion, when Men begin to judg a little for themselves, the Spirit of Heresy comes in, and then away they go. But from hence I gather that the Sentence of the Pope, or of a plenary Council, is no certain Rule for ending Controversies, nor certain means of preventing Divisions; if some other means be not used to keep Men from *trying the Spirits* and *proving all things*. What they are, the Cardinal knew very well, but mentioned them not, nor shall I need to do it. In the mean time, when whole Countries went off from that Church as soon as they had a little considered what they had believed upon her Authority, I need not say, whether the Separation was caused by *the Doctrine of that Church*, or by the *Malice of the Devil*, but leave the World to judg. But,

(2.) How could those be certain means of composing Controversies, concerning which even in their own Church there were the greatest Controversies of all? What deference is to be given to the Sentence of their chief Pastor, has always been a great Dispute amongst them, and the best, if not the greatest Part of their Church do not think him infallible. Nor is it yet agreed what is requisite to make the Sentence of a general Council decisive, nor of those Councils that have contradicted one another, which they are to follow. And that cannot be a certain Rule for deciding Controversies, which is it self controverted. So that they have neither that Union of Members among themselves, nor those certain means of Union which they pretend to have.

Which

Which I shall farther shew from a Learned Writer of
 ¶ Ep. par. 8. their own, the Famous || *Launoy*, who in an elaborate
 P. 353. Epistle to *Nic. Gatinæus*, wholly overthrows the pretence
 in Question. For whether or no there be such an Uni-
 on in the Church of *Rome* as will serve the Cardinal's
 turn, I will leave the Reader to judg, by this short and
 faithful account of that Epistle.

First then, He proves unanswerably by numerous
 and apposite Testimonies of every Age, That from the
 Apostles Times till the Council of *Trent*, the constant
 universal Doctrine concerning *the Church* was this, that
 it is *the Society of the Faithful*, without ever inserting
 into the Definition of it any thing relating to its being
 united to the Pope, or any other Bishop as to a Visible
 Head.

P. 400. Nay, Secondly, That all the most Learned Lovers of
 415. Antiquity, and Godly Opposers of Novelty in the *Roman*
 Communion, both in the Time of the Council of *Trent*,
 and ever since, have retained that Notion of the Church,
 and stuck to the Ancient Definition.

P. 415. And Thirdly, That *Canisius* and *Bellarmin* have egre-
 419. giously innovated in their Doctrine, by adding to the
 ancient Definition such things as are repugnant to all An-
 tiquity, and mean while that they opposed each o-
 ther; *Canisius* making it *of the nature* of the Church
 to be under a * *Monarch*, and giving no place in his
 Definition of it to other Governours, to whom the
 Church also is to be united: Whereas *Bellarmin* makes an
Aristocracy wherein one is Chief, at least † a tempered
 and limited Monarchy essential to the Church; going
 in this matter against Antiquity, against *Canisius*, and
 against himself, in that he elsewhere makes *Antiquity* a
 Note of the true Church, and says 'tis a Demonstration
 of the Novelty of a Doctrine, when the first Authors can

* Uno & sum-
mo post Chri-
stum capite.

† -- Esse eatum
hominum, &c.
colligatum, sub
regimine legi-
timorum pa-
storum ac prae-
cipue unius
Christi in ter-
ris Vicarii Ro-
mani Pontifi-
cis. De Eccl.
l. 3. c. 2.

be

be named and pointed to, which is his own Case and *Canisius's*, as to this Doctrine.

He reflects upon both of 'em, for ill *Logick* in these P. 418, 419.
428. Definitions, and shews how they destroy each other. He censures the Followers of *Canisius* sharply and judiciously, and then remarks that tho *Bellarmino* have greater Authority amongst Divines; yet *Canisius's* Definition is more generally received; and that for four Reasons: because there is more Court-Flattery in it; because it is put into Catechisms which the other is not, and so sticks by virtue of an early Impression, because some Men are mad upon Novelties; and lastly, others insufferably Ignorant as to the Holy Scriptures, and (Ancient) Tradition, the Principles of true Theology.

Fourthly, He thinks they have done harm to the Church, and that for these Reasons: (1.) Because, for P. 430. want of *Logick*, they have confounded the *Nature* of the Church, with the *State* of it. (2.) They have neglected *St. Paul's* Direction, of not being tossed to and fro, &c. (3.) Are condemned by *Tertullian*, who bids us adhere to what is first. And, (4.) By *Vincentius Lyrinensis*. And, (5.) Have given ill Example, by which the Reformers can justify themselves. And, lastly, Have plainly condemned several Popes, and the whole *Lateran* Council, under *Innocent III*, as not sufficiently knowing what the Church was, since their Notion of it could not content those which came after them: A great Injury, and of dangerous Consequence.

Lastly, Upon a Comparison of one with the other, P. 432, &c. and of both with the Antient Doctrine and Discipline of the Church: he looks upon *Bellarmin's* Definition as the better of the Two, because it may be so mollified by the Help of the Word *Præcipue* [chiefly] which is in it, as to admit of a tolerable Reconciliation with the Definition

of the Antients; which, as he shews, can no way agree with that of *Canisius*.

F: 450.

And upon the whole he concludes, That however *Bellarmin's* might be preferable, if either of them were necessary; yet it will be hard for Catholics to make their Complaints of Innovating, which they heap upon Hereticks, to appear just, so long as they themselves shall retain such a Novel Definition; and that if *Gregory VIIth's* Rule were observed, *viz. That nothing should be drawn into Example or Authority, which is contrary to the Fathers*; then even this his Definition, tho it had been received, yet ought to be rejected. To this purpose that *Accurate Writer*, as he is deservedly called by *F. Walsh*, has argued to the utter confusion of the Cardinal's Argument from Union with the Pope as Head, or of the *Members among themselves*.

|| Letter to Bp. of
Linc. p. 319.

For how can that be a Note of the True Church now, which never was thought to belong to the Nature of it for 1500 Years together, and which their own *most Learned Lovers of Antiquity*, and *Pious Opposers of Novelty*, do not think essential to it at this Day?

And where is the so much boasted Consent of the Members amongst themselves in all Matters of Faith?

I believe the holy Catholick Church, is an Article of Faith. I would know of those Gentlemen who are at such perfect agreement amongst themselves, what this Church is? *Bellarmino* answers one thing, *Canisius* another, so contrary, that if one speaks true, the other must needs have told me that which is false. And while the Definition of the former is followed by some, and that of the later, which is the worse, is more generally received; *Launoy*, and many more of the most Learned sort, stick to the Antients, who are as different from both, as they are from one another. And yet after all we must

must be told that they are perfectly agreed in all matters of Faith; and that this invisible unintelligible Union shews plainly that the *Roman* is the true Church. One would hardly think that they are in earnest; unless by Union they mean an equal Resolution to carry on the Dispute as long as they can contend and no longer: Which kind of Union is to be met with almost every Term in *Westminster-Hall*; where one may see two Parties prosecuting one another with all imaginable vigour, who yet resolve to be quiet, when the Bench has made them so. Not that the Party who is cast in the Suit must needs change his Opinion of his own Cause, because the last Verdict was against him; but that if a new Trial will not be granted, he is bound to *acquiesce* in the Judgment of the Court, because it has a Sheriff, with the *Posse Comitatus*, to put it into Execution. Thus they that make the Sentence of the Pope, and they that make the Sentence of a Council, the Sentence of the Church, are united in a Resolution to stand to the Arbitrement of the Church; there being a certain sensible Obligation upon them to profess that they will acquiesce in its Determination: But in the mean time they may undoubtedly quarrel amongst themselves, about Questions of such mighty Importance as that we mentioned even now, and this without breach of Union amongst themselves; till the Sentence of the Pope, or the Sentence of a *Plenary Council*, or the Sentence of both, comes to part them: Which yet will be long enough first, if each side of the Question be abetted with numerous and able Parties, that are at present both of 'em resolved to submit absolutely to the Church; lest one of them upon an unreasonable Sentence should be provoked to change its Resolution. And thus, as we observed before, the Question about the *Immaculate Conception* has been left undecided

so long, lest by determining that, a more dangerous Question should be raised by the disobliged Party. But if it should so happen that the Church cannot well avoid declaring her self in such a Case, this new-fashion'd Union goes forward still, tho she speaks so ambiguously, that each Party fancies the Sentence to be on its own side; which was done often at *Trent* with great Application and Art: Particularly in the Decrees concerning *Grace*, and *Assurance of being Justified*, &c. Which being finished, *Soto* and *Vega* differed not only as much, but something more than they did at first: for now they had a new Question to debate, *viz.* on which side the Council had decreed; and so they fell to writing great Books upon it, against one another: But for all this they were admirably agreed, because they agreed in submission to the Council. I proceed to shew,

III. That *that Unity which is indeed a Note of the Church, we have, and that in a much greater degree than they.*

Which Point will, I hope, yield some Discourse, that will be more useful, than barely to discover Mistakes, and expose Sophistry. For here I shall represent, as well as I can, the true Grounds and Notions of Church-Unity, and then see who has most reason to pretend to it, they or we.

1. There is the *Unity* of submitting to *one* Head, our Lord *Jesus Christ*; which is the Foundation of all other Christian Unity, and therefore mentioned by *St. Paul*, amongst the principal Reasons why the Church is *one* Body, *One Lord*.

Eph. iv. 5.

2. There is the *Unity* of professing the Common Faith that was *once delivered to the Saints*, which is grounded upon

upon the Authority of the Scriptures, and summarily expounded in the Antient Creeds. And therefore to *One Lord*, the Apostle in the forementioned place adds, *one Faith*.

3. There is an Unity of Sacraments in the Church, *One Baptism*; by which we are all admitted into the same state of Duties and of Priviledges, undertaking the Conditions of the New Covenant, and gaining a Right to the Promises thereof. Thus saith St. Paul, *By one Spirit we are all Baptized into one Body*: And the like Unity is inferred from the other Sacraments. *We being many are one Bread, and one Body, for we are all partakers of that one Bread*. And again, *we are all made to drink into one Spirit*. 1 Cor. xii. 13.
1 Cor. x. 17.

4. There is also an Unity of Obedience to all the Institutions and Laws of *Christ*, which is an Instance of Unity that ought by no means to be forgotten; this being no less a common Duty than the Profession of the Faith, the performance whereof uniteth us effectually to him, as to our Head, and maketh us living Members of his Body.

5. There is the Unity of Christian Affection and brotherly Kindness, of which our Lord spake when he said, *By this shall all Men know that ye are my Disciples, if ye love one another*. Thus St. Paul, *The Members should have the same care one of another*, &c. 1 Cor. xii.

6. There is an Unity of Discipline and Government; which is maintained chiefly by retaining for substance the same Form that was left in the Church by the Apostles, by the Bishops and Pastors confederating together, as much as may be for the edification of their Flocks; by regarding every Regular Act of Authority in one Church, as the Act of the whole, and giving no occasion to breach of Christian-Communion, by abusing a lawful, or by claiming an undue Authority, &c.

7. There

7. There is likewise an Unity of Communion in the Service and Worship of God, in *glorifying God with one Mouth*, in joining in the same Religious Assemblies, for Prayer and Sacraments, for Acts of common Piety and Devotion according to the Rules of the Gospel. I need not mention any more Instances of Christian *Unity*, since those that are more particular, may be easily deduced from these.

Now to speak clearly, there *ought to be* all these kinds and Instances of Unity in the Church; but we see evidently that they are not all there, I mean in every Part and Member of the Church. And therefore they are not all necessary to the Being of a Church, how necessary soever they may be, whether to the Wellbeing of it, or to the Salvation of those Persons whereof the Church consists. But some of them are necessary to the Being of the Church; and they are the acknowledgment of the *one Lord*, the Profession of the *one Faith*, and admission into the state of Christian Duties and Privileges by *one Baptism*. And this is all that I can find absolutely necessary to the Being of a Church, inasmuch as the Apostle says, *That we are all baptized into one Body*. And therefore so far as *Unity* in these things is spread and obtains in the World, so far and no farther is the Body of the Church propagated, because it is one by this Unity. But then indeed there ought to be a farther Unity, an Unity of observing all the Institutions of our Lord Jesus, an Unity of Christian Charity and good Will, an Unity of Government and Discipline, an Unity of Communion in Religious Assemblies, to which I will add also that there ought to be an Unity of Care to keep out of the Communion of *Christians* all dangerous Errors and unlawful Practices. And when such begin to appear, much more if they have taken root and
are

are grown to a scandal, to root them out again. But Unity in these things does not run through the whole Church, or through that Body which is one in the three former Respects ; and therefore it must necessarily be granted that the Church is not one Body in those later Respects, tho it ought to be so.

But because these are proper Instances of Church-Unity, tho not absolutely necessary to the Being of the Church, therefore it cannot be denied that those particular Churches which keep Unity in these Respects better than others do, have the Mark of Ecclesiastical Unity in a higher Degree than those others, inasmuch as they have not only that Unity which is a Mark of a true Church, but that also which is the Mark of a pure Church ; and are not only one Body in those things, without which they could not be Parts of the Catholick Church, but one also in those things, wherein all other Parts of the Church ought to be one with them.

We therefore according to Truth, allow the Church of *Rome* to be a Part of the Catholick Church, because she holds that *one Lord*, that *one Faith*, that *one Baptism*, which we hold, & without which there were no Church at all : And thus far she maintains Catholick Unity.

But inasmuch as she hath violated the Institution of our Lord *Jesus* concerning the other Sacrament, as in other Respects, so by withholding the Cup from the People, notwithstanding he said, *Drink ye all of this*, and that the Apostle said, *We are all made to drink into one Spirit*, even all that belong to the Body of *Christ* ; she has departed from Catholick Unity, the Unity of Obedience.

Because she will not be content to be a Sister, but claims to be the Mother and Mistress of all other Christian Churches, and has advanced her Bishop to be
Head

Head and Monarch of the whole Church, and will have Communion with no other Christian Society but such as will be content to become her Subjects, and will allow no Act of Ecclesiastical Authority to be valid, but in a State of Dependence upon her, she has therefore departed from the Catholick Unity of Government and Discipline.

Because she has brought the *Sacrifice of the Mass, Transubstantiation, Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, &c.* into her Creed, and Practices suitable to such false Doctrines into her Worship, she has departed from that Purity of professing the Faith &c. in which all Churches should be one.

And because she will have no Communion with us but upon these Terms, which are impossible, she has departed from the Unity of Catholick Communion.

Finally, Because she has pursued all Christians that dare to open their Mouths against these Innovations, with *Anathema's, &c.* and sacrificed the Lives of innumerable Christians to her resentments, she has departed from the Unity of Catholick Charity.

With these things the Church of *England* cannot be charged, nor with any such things as these, not truly and justly, I am sure. In her Worship and Administration of the Sacraments, she transgresseth not the Institutions of the Lord; in her Government she encroaches not upon the Liberty of other Churches. To her Creed she hath added no Novelties: To her Communion she hath annex'd no unlawful Conditions; she doth not unchurch those Parts of *Christendom* that hold the Unity of the Faith; no not that Church it self, the Church of *Rome*, which has added thereunto so many enormous Innovations. She hath not embroiled the
World,

World, nor wasted Countries with violence. Upon such accounts as these, she hath the Mark of *Christian Unity* incomparably more than the other Church.

From such distinct notions of *Unity* as I have laid down, it is evident that nothing can be more idle than to seek for a Church by that Mark of Unity which the Cardinal lays down, which comes to no more than this, that Men be all of a mind, that there be no Divisions among them, &c. since it is not meerly Unity that is a Mark of the true Church, but Unity in the true Faith; nor is Unity the Mark of a pure Church, unless it be upon Terms of Obedience to God, of Charity to one another, of keeping the Faith unmixed with Errors and Innovations, and the Worship of God free from material Defects and forbidden Practices.

From hence also the Folly of that conceit may be easily discerned, that in this divided State of *Christendom*, there must be one Church which is the only Church of *Christ* exclusively to all the rest, that are not in Communion with her: Which is as much as to say, that because there is not that Unity amongst *Christians* which there ought to be, therefore there is none at all; and because they are not united in *one Communion*, therefore they are not united in *one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism*. That fond Principle now mentioned, is advanced by the *Romanist*, for the sake of this Inference; that because we grant the Church to be but one, and withall acknowledg them to be a true Church; therefore we being divided from them, can be no true Church our selves: That is to say, because we acknowledg, that they have that one Faith, in which all that are united belong to the Church, therefore we are out of the Church our selves who have the Unity

Z

of

The Seventh Note of the Church,

of that Faith too, and moreover the Unity of observing all the Institutions of Christ, and the Unity of Catholick Terms of Communion, &c. which they have not.

If some part of the Church gives just cause of Offence, or if another takes Offence where none is given, this is indeed contrary to the Duty of the Members of the Church, but not utterly inconsistent with their being Members of it. And if *St. Paul* was in the right when he said. *If the Foot shall say, because I am not the Head, I am not of the Body, is it therefore not of the Body?* It will be also true, that tho the Foot should say to the Hand, thou art not of the Body, because thou art not the Foot, the Hand would be of the Body for all that.

As for the Unity of Communion which they boast so much of in the Church of *Rome*; I say 'tis an Unity of Communion *among themselves*, but 'tis not the *Catholick* Unity of Communion, because the Terms of it are many of them unjust and unlawful; whereas we of the Church of *England*, having as much Unity of Communion among our selves as they, have this also to say, as we have abundantly shewn, that the Terms of our Communion are every one of them just and lawful, and therefore ours is a *Catholick* Unity. If there are some *Protestants* that will not communicate with us, it is no more our Fault, than that the *Papists* refuse to do so. And tho in point of *Interest* this tends to weaken, yet in *Controversy* it cannot prejudice the common cause of Reformation. That part of the *West* that has left the Church of *Rome* may labour under Discords, that affect their very Communion, while she her self does not, and yet

yet in the Cause against her they may be all in the Right. Where Truth is maintained against a corrupt Church, there may yet be Disobedience to Authority, overvaluing Questions of no great moment, a greater stress laid upon Opinions and Practices than the Cause will bear, and this shall be sufficient to break *Christian* Communion. And at the same time gross Errors may be maintained, and with one consent imposed upon the World by the other Church, and all the while, the Differences how weighty soever that happen by the bye, may be so over-ruled by Force and Power, and the sensible Interests of this World, that they shall not affect their Communion with one another. But for the Reasons already laid down, it were a fond thing to chuse a Church by the Mark of such Unity.

In short, If we would in all Respects keep within the Unity of the Church, this must be done by professing true Doctrine, by leading good Lives, by a charitable Spirit and Behaviour towards all Christians, by frequenting Prayers and Sacraments, and by submitting to the Authority of our lawful Guides in all things of Indifference and Expedience: And then we may be sure that whatever others do, *we keep the Unity of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace.* And though the Church after all is not that *one Body* in all Respects which it ought to be, and which it would be if all Men did their Duty, yet that we our selves are such Members of that one Body as we ought to be, and as all others ought to be likewise. Now all this Unity we may keep in the Communion of the Church of *England*, but we can-

cannot keep it all in the Communion of the *Roman* Church, as the Terms thereof now stand. But if this Unity be not enough, when once the *Romanists* can prove that Union to the Pope as Head of the Church, and Union to the *Roman* Church in all that she believes and teaches, is also necessary to our Being of the Church, or even to our maintaining that Unity which ought to be amongst all *Christians*; we will also acknowledg the Pope's Supremacy, and believe as the *Roman* Church believes; but not till then.

T H E E N D.

L O N D O N,

Printed by *J. D.* for *Richard Chiswel* at the Rose and Crown in
St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1687.

The Eighth Note of the CHURCH
E X A M I N E D,

V I Z,

Sanctity of Doctrine.

Octava Nota est Sanctitas Doctrina. Bellar. de Notis Ecclesiæ.
L. iv. c. 11.

I M P R I M A T U R.

June 4. 1687.

Hen. Maurice.

SEeing the New Covenant is the Charter upon which the Church of Christ is founded, and all the Blessings which this Covenant promises, are appropriated to that Sacred Society; to be in Communion with it is doubtless a matter of vast importance to the Souls of Men, and it being so, it is not to be imagined but that the blessed Jesus (the most concerned and careful Friend of Souls that ever was) hath been sufficiently mindful to leave such plain, and easy Directions behind him, how we may find his Church, and satisfy our selves whether we are in Fellowship with it or no, as that neither the Learned, nor Unlearned may be left in the dark for resolution in such a momentous Enquiry. But how much the Church of *Rome* hath made it her Business to snarl and perplex several Points

of Religion, which our Saviour left plain and obvious enough to all Capacities, is too notorious; and in nothing more than in this, how to discover and find out the true Church: In order to which her most Learned Doctors (and particularly Cardinal *Bellarmin*) have given us certain Notes; by which, as they pretend, the true Church may be distinguished, by honest and diligent Enquiries, from all false Churches whatsoever. But how far these Notes are from performing what is promised for 'em, hath been sufficiently proved upon a very fair Examination of the Seven first of 'em.

I proceed therefore to the Eighth, *viz. Sanctity of Doctrine*: Which I doubt not to make appear, performs as little as either of the former. In order to which I shall endeavour to shew,

- I. What the Cardinal means by Sanctity of Doctrine.
- II. That according to his Notion of it, Sanctity of Doctrine is no certain Note of the true Church.
- III. In what Sense it is a certain Note, by which any honest Enquirer may distinguish a true Church from a false one.
- IV. That neither in this, nor the Cardinal's Notion of it, the true Church can be found by any honest Enquirer, according to the Principles of the Church of *Rome*.

I. What it is that the Cardinal here means by Sanctity of Doctrine? To which, in short, I answer, That which he means by it, is, the Profession of the true Religion, both as to Doctrine of Faith, and Doctrine of Manners, without any mixture of Error. For so he explains himself, *The true Church is not only Catholick, and Apostolick, and One, but also Holy according to the Constantinopolitan*

Constantinopolitan Creed; but its evident the Church is said to be Holy, because its Profession is Holy, containing nothing false as to Doctrine of Faith, nothing unjust as to Doctrine of Manners. And a little after, By this Note, saith he, it's evident that no Church but ours, is a true Church: because there is no Sect either of Pagans or Philosophers, or Jews, or Turks, or Hereticks, which doth not contain some Errors that have been exploded, and are manifestly contrary to right Reason. By which it's evident that he excludes all sorts of Errors from that Profession of Religion, which he here sets up as a Mark of the true Church. And therefore, after he had given a brief Enumeration of the Errors of all other Sects, as well of Pagans, and Jews, and Mahometans, as of Christians: He thus concludes, But as for our Catholick Church it teaches no Error, no Turpitude, nothing against Reason, (no not excepting Transubstantiation) though many things above Reason; therefore she alone is absolutely Holy, and to her alone appertains what we say in our Creed, I believe the Holy Church. In which Words he expressly points and directs us to his Catholick Church, by this Mark or Note, That it teaches no Error, &c. By which it is evident that Sanctity of Doctrine, in the Cardinal's Sense, consists in an unerring profession of the true Religion, without any so much as the least intermixture of Error. Now tho it is certain that that is the best and purest Church, which hath the least of Error and Corruption in its Doctrine and Discipline, yet it is as certain that that which is the best Church, is not the only true Church: For the only true Church, is the Catholick Church, which consists of a great many particular Churches; whereof some are more, and some less pure from Error and Corruption, and yet all of 'em true Churches: For all particular Bodies and Societies of Christians that are true parts of

the Catholick Church, are true Churches, as being Homogenous Parts of the Catholick Church; and consequently partaking of the same common Nature with it. But when we are discoursing of the Notes of the true Church, that which we mean by 'em is, such certain Marks and Characters by which an honest Enquirer may distinguish such Societies of Christians as are the true Churches, of which the true Catholick Church consists, from such as are not; and therefore that can be no true Note of the true Church, which doth not distinguish it from all false Churches, and whose contrary is consistent with the being of a true Church. I proceed therefore,

II. To shew that Sanctity of Doctrine, according to *Bellarmin's* Sense of it, that is a pure profession of true Religion, without any intermixture of Error, is no true Note, or Mark, or Character, by which any honest Enquirer can certainly distinguish the true Church from all false Churches. And this I doubt not will evidently appear, if we consider what are the necessary Properties of all true Notes, by which things are to be known and distinguished; and they are these four.

1. Every true Note ought to be common to all, of the same kind with the thing which it notifies.

2. It ought to be proper and peculiar to that kind of Thing, of which it is a Note, and not common to Things of another kind.

3. It ought to be more known than the Thing which it notifies.

4. It ought to be inseparable to it. The three last of which *Bellarmin* himself owns to be necessary Properties of every true Note, *Cap. 2.* though the first he did not think meet to take notice of for a Reason best known to him-

himself, if therefore this Note according to *Bellarmino's* sense of it, hath neither of these Properties belonging to it, it can be no true Note of the true Church; and that none of 'em do belong to it, I doubt not but I shall make it evidently appear.

1. First, Every true Note ought to be common to all of the same kind with the thing which it notifies. Thus every true Note of a true Man, for instance, ought to be common to all human kind; and so every true Note of every wise Man ought to be common to all wise Men; and by the same Rule, every true Note of the true Church ought to be common to all true Churches: For seeing the true Church is nothing else but only a Collection of all true Churches, whatsoever is a certain Note of *the* true Church, must necessarily belong to *all* true Churches in the World. And indeed since the end of our enquiry after the true Church is, that we may communicate with it; and since we can no otherwise communicate with the true Church, but by communicating with some particular Church that is a true part of it; the proper use of the Notes of the true Church is to direct our Enquirers, whether this or that Church be a true part of it? or, which is the same thing, whether by communicating with this or that particular Church we do communicate with the true Catholick Church? And therefore unless the Notes of the true Catholick Church are such, as do appertain to all true Churches, they can never give us any certain direction in what Church we may communicate with the true Catholick Church: for seeing we can communicate with the true Catholick Church in none but a true Church, no Note can give us any certain direction where to communicate with the Catholick Church, but what directs us to a true Church; and no Note
can

can certainly direct us to a true Church, but what belongs to all true Churches. If therefore not to err in its Profession be a certain Note whereby to find the true Catholick Church, it must necessarily belong to all true Churches, and consequently that can be no true Church, which in any instance whatsoever errs in its Profession; and indeed seeing all the true Churches in the World, are only so many simular parts of the true Catholick Church, and the true Catholick Church is only the whole of all those simular parts, or all true Churches together, whatsoever the Catholick Church is besides its being the whole, all the true Churches must be of, which it doth consist; and consequently, if that be unerring, these must be so also: for how is it possible that the whole which consists of all the parts, should be unerring, unless all the parts are unerring? if therefore not to err in its Profession, be a true Note of the true Church, all true Churches must necessarily partake of it; and consequently all those must be false Churches which profess any Error; than which there is scarce any Proposition in Religion more notoriously false. 'Tis true, whatsoever Church errs in any Fundamental Article of Religion, doth thereby cease from being a true Church, because those Articles are the very Foundations upon which every true Church stands; and therefore when any Church removes them, or any of them, it must necessarily sink from the very being of a true Church into a false and heretical Communion; but there are many Errors which do not at all touch, or in the least affect the Fundamentals of Religion, and these a true Church may possibly profess, and yet maintain her Foundations firm and unshaken; and so long as a Church professes all those Truths which are necessary to the being of a true Church,

Church, it is so far a true Church, tho together with that it should profess contrary to some other Truths which are not necessary to the being of a true Church: for how can its professing any Error which doth not contradict any Truth which is necessary to the *being* of a true Church, make it cease to *be* a true Church? or how can that be a false Church upon the account of its Profession, which professes all those Truths which are necessary to the founding and constituting a true Church? If the profession of every Error in Religion be sufficient to destroy the verity of a Church, then the profession of every Truth must be necessary to found it; because every true Church being founded upon Truth, there is no Error can destroy it, but what takes away the Truth which founds; and therefore unless it be founded upon the Profession of every Truth, it cannot be destroyed by the Profession of every Error; and consequently none can be true Churches but such as profess every true Proposition in Religion; which being admitted, the Profession of every true Church must contain almost as many Articles, as it self doth contain Communicants. And indeed if none can be true Churches but such as profess no Errors, no two Churches whatsoever can differ in any Opinion, tho never so inconsiderable, but one of the two must be a false Church; because where-ever there is a difference in Opinion, there must be an Error on one side or other: as for instance; There was a very early difference in Opinion between the Eastern and Western Churches about the time of the Celebration of Easter; in which, if either of them were in the right, to be sure the other must be erroneous, and if neither, both: Did then the erring Church continue a true Church or no, notwithstanding its Error? if it did, then a true Church may err in
its

its Profession and yet be a true Church still ; if it did not, then both were false Churches ; because tho each believed that the other err'd, yet for a great while they mutually owned each other for true Churches ; in which (if every Error destroys the verity of a Church) they both of 'em err'd, and thereupon both cease to be true Churches. And if we enquire into the Church of *Rome*, which now pretends to be the only true Church in the World, we shall find that in several instances, it professes now, quite contrary to what it profess heretofore : *Vid. Note 3d, p. 65.* Either therefore the Profession of some Errors is consistent with the being of a true Church, or the Roman Church must either have been a false Church heretofore, or be a false Church now ; and seeing the Roman Church now consists of several Churches, some of which profess contrary to one another (as particularly in that celebrated Question, Whether the Pope be Superiour to a General Council, or a General Council to the Pope ?) it's certain, that if either of 'em are in the right, there must be an erroneous Profession on one side or other. And if the Roman Church err in any of its parts, how can it be unerring in the whole ? which is nothing but all the parts together : for if she allow any Church to be a true Church, or part of the true Church, which professes any Error, she errs herself (supposing an unerring Profession to be a true Note of the true Church) and consequently is herself a false Church ; if she doth not, then in receiving Churches which differ in their Profession, she receives into her Communion some that are no true Churches ; which I doubt will go as far towards the unchurching her, as the Profession of most Errors whatsoever : In short therefore, if not to err in its Profession in any matter, be a Note of the true Church,

Church, all true Churches must necessarily partake of it, and consequently none can be true Churches, which, in any point whatsoever, profess erroneously: which, as I have proved, is utterly false; and which, if it were true, would perhaps as much damnify the Church of *Rome* in the Opinion of any sober and honest Enquirer, as any one Church now extant in the World.

2. Secondly, Every true Note ought to be proper and peculiar to that kind of things of which it is a Note, and not common to things of another kind, otherwise it is impossible that it should truly distinguish the one from the other: But this Note of not erring in its Profession is not peculiar to true Churches; for seeing there may be a Schism without any Error in Faith, or Heresy, we must either allow Schismatical Societies of Christians to be true Churches, (which the Church of *Rome* to be sure will never admit) or that it is by no means peculiar to true Churches not to err in their Faith. That which may be common to Schismatical Communion with the true Church, cannot be peculiar to the true Church, supposing Schismatical Communion not to be the true Church, or the true parts of the true Church: but the Cardinal himself owns that there have been Schisms which did not err in their Faith, and yet were without the true Church; for so in his forecited Cap. 2. *There may be Doctrine pure, saith he, from all Error in a false Church; for so pure Schismaticks, as heretofore the Luciferians and Donatists, had in the beginning very sound Doctrine among 'em, and yet were without the true Church:* Where, by the way, it's evident the good Man had quite forgot that Sanctity of Doctrine was hereafter to be one of his Notes of the true Church; for if (as he tells us in this very Chapter) the Notes of the true Church are such as are proper

and peculiar to it, it's plain that his Memory fail'd him, either when he made Sanctity of Doctrine to be one of these Notes, or when he allowed this Note to be common to false Churches with the true: Seeing therefore there have been Communities of Christians in the World which have not err'd in their Faith, and yet were neither the true Church, nor any true parts of it; and seeing what hath been may be again, how is it possible for any honest Enquirer after the true Church, to find any one Church in the World, to which this Note of not erring is proper and peculiar? The Catholics did not err in their Faith, the *Donatists* and *Luciferians* did not err in theirs; how then is it possible to discover by this Note of not erring in Faith, which of the three were the true Church? seeing that that can be no true Note of the true Church which is not peculiar to it, and that not erring in Faith was common to 'em both.

3. Thirdly, Every true Note ought to be more known than the thing which it notifies: for how can we know a thing by that which is as unknown to us as the thing it self? If therefore not to err in any point whatsoever, be a true Note of the true Church, the truth of every Article comprized in the Profession of that which is the true Church, must be more known, than that it is the true Church; which, considering how very large and extensive the publick Professions of Churches now are, cannot be supposed, without making the true Church to be one of the darkest and obscurest things in the World. For besides that, according to the Principle of the Cardinal and his Church, it is the true Church only can fully instruct a Man in the truth of all those Points of which the unerring Profession of the true Church consists; and therefore a Man must have

have found the true Church, and been instructed by it, before he can be certain that those Points are all true, of which more hereafter : Besides which, I say, it is to be considered, that there are sundry Doctrines now professed by most Churches, of which ordinary Capacities can make no certain Judgment. I confess, if the publick Professions of the Churches now in being were confined to the Fundamental Articles of Religion, it were an easy matter for an ordinary Enquirer to satisfy himself concerning the truth of 'em ; because whatsoever is fundamental is so plainly revealed, that probity of Mind, together with sound Intellectuals, are the only Accomplishments that are requisite to Mens attainment of the knowledg of it : but seeing the generality of the publick Professions of Churches do, together with such Doctrines as are fundamental, comprehend such as are not, yea, and sometimes such as are very remote from Fundamentals ; and seeing many of these are not so plainly revealed, but that *pro* and *con* they are involved with such difficulties as have perplexed even the most learned and judicious Enquirers ; to satisfy one's self fully that such Professions as these, are in all points true, without the least intermixture of Error, requires great Sagacity as well as Probity of Mind : For there is scarce any one Church now extant in the World, but what professes some Doctrines which in some other Churches are hotly controverted and opposed ; and seeing there are sundry Churches in the World, which in sundry Points profess contrary to one another, and there are scarce any two Churches which in all Points are agreed, it is certain that a great part of 'em must in one Point or other be erroneous ; and seeing the Church of *Rome* doth in several Articles differ from all other Churches in the World ; either she by this Note must be a

false Church, or there is no true Church in the World but her self. Now in the midst of such a vast multiplicity of Professions, how is it possible for an ordinary Enquirer to conclude with any certainty, which of 'em is true, and which false? especially considering that as to some of the Points in which they differ, there are such fair probabilities *pro* and *con* as are sufficient to suspend any modest Judgment from determining it self one way or other: And that others of 'em depend upon such Scholastical Niceties, and are defended and opposed by such subtile and metaphysical Reasonings, such critical Senses of Texts and ambiguous Accounts of Ecclesiastical Antiquity, as that scarce one Man in a thousand is capable of making any certain judgment concerning them. If therefore, before I can conclude, that this or that is a true Church, it must be more known and evident to me, that it doth not err in any Point whatsoever, than that it is a true Church; doubtless to determine which is the true Church, is one of the most obscure and difficult Points in the World, and I must be a very learned and judicious Divine before I can modestly pretend to have found it: To what a miserable uncertainty then are Mankind abandoned, when 'tis as much as their Souls are worth to be in the true Church, and yet are left to seek it by such an intricate Note as this, whereby scarce one Man in a thousand is capable of finding it!

4. And Lastly, Every true Note ought to be inseparable to the Thing which it notifies; for there is nothing can notify or make known a Thing without which the Thing may be what it is; and if that which is the Note of it may be separated from it, it may be the very same Thing which it is, tho it hath not that Note. If therefore this Note of an unerring Profession be not inseparable

separable from the true Church, it may be the true Church, tho it be not unerring in its Profession. Wherefore, before I can be certain that any Church which pretends to be the true Church, is the true Church ; I must be certain that this Note of not erring is inseparable to it : But before I can be certain that this Note is inseparable to any one Church now extant, I must be certain not only that it doth not err now (which, as I have shewed above, the generality of Men can never be) but also that it never hath erred, nor ever will : for, as the Cardinal hath stated the matter, the thing of which we are to enquire, is not which of the Churches now extant are true Churches, or parts of the Catholick Church, but which of 'em are the true Catholick Church. If we were only to enquire which of 'em are true parts of the Catholick Church, all that we had to do, was to satisfy our selves which of 'em at present have the true Notes of a true part of the Catholick Church ; but as for particular Churches, it is agreed of all hands that they may be true parts of the Catholick Church at one time, and yet not be so at another ; so that as to particular Churches, all that I need to enquire is only this, Whether at present they are true Churches, or, which is the same thing, whether they have at present the true Notes of true Churches ? But if I enquire (as the Cardinal doth) which of all the Churches now extant is the true Catholick Church ; before I can be fully resolved, I must not only be satisfied which of 'em is a true Church at present, but also which of them shall always continue so : because tho particular Churches may cease to be true Churches, yet the Catholick Church cannot, it being founded on that promise of our Saviour, that *the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it*. And therefore, before I can be secure of any present Church that it is the true Catholick,

lick, I must have some certainty not only that it hath not erred for the time past, and that it doth not err at present, but also that it will not err for the time to come; for seeing the true Catholick Church is always to continue, if not to err in its profession be a true Note of it, it must always be inseparable to it, as well for the time to come, as for the time past and present. And therefore before I can be certain of any Church now extant, that it is the only true Catholick Church, by this Note of an unerring Profession, I ought to have very good assurance that it is inseparable to it, not only for the time past, and present, but also for the time to come. But that it is possible for a Church which doth not err now, and did not err heretofore, to err hereafter, the Church of *Rome* cannot deny; because she allows no Church now extant, not to err, but her self, and yet owns that there are many Churches now in being, which once did not err, and for several Ages continued untainted with Error, which yet have erred since, and therefore are now no true Churches; and therefore seeing that in the Nature of the Thing it is no more impossible that a Church which doth not err now, may have erred heretofore, and may err again hereafter, than that a Church which errs now, may not have erred heretofore, and may not err again hereafter, I cannot conclude of any Church that because it doth not err at present, therefore it never hath erred, nor ever will. Suppose then, that there were only two Churches in the World, *viz.* the *Roman* and *Greek*, and that the *Roman* Church at present doth not err, and the *Greek* doth; I can from hence no more conclude, that not erring is inseparable to the *Roman* Church, than that erring is inseparable to the *Greek*. The *Roman* Church doth not err now, what then? neither did the *Greek* Church err once; why then may not the *Greek* as well be the true Church,

Church, because once it did not err, as the *Roman*, because now it doth not? Seeing that not to have erred heretofore, and not to err now, are only different Respects of the same thing to different Times, and that the not erring at one Time doth no more notify the true Church, than the not erring at another; it is not therefore sufficient to notify either to be the true Church, that this Note belonged to it at such or such a time, whether it be the time past or the time present, seeing one time or other it hath belonged to 'em both, but that of the two must be the true Church to which it always belonged, and from which it was never separated. But before I can pretend to be certain that it always belonged to the Church of *Rome*, I must have perused the Histories of the Church, through all times past to the present Moment: But alas, those Histories, as the Learned of all sides confess, are some of 'em so short and imperfect, others so partial and insincere, and others so repugnant and contradictory to one another, that supposing there were some Church now in being that never erred, and that Church were the *Roman*, it is next to impossible for me to be certain of it; for even in the Histories of the Church of *Rome*, which pretends to be the only unerring Church, there are so many (at least seeming) Contradictions of one Pope and General Council to another, that it is impossible for any Man, who is not prepossessed with a strong Opinion of her Infallibility, to pronounce with any degree of certainty, that she never erred. And methinks 'tis something hard that I must seek the true Church by such a Note, whereby it will be impossible for me to find it, without spending a great part of my Life in laborious researches of Ecclesiastical History; wherein after all, in seeking after a Church that never erred, I doubt I shall but seek for a Needle in a Bottle of Hay.

But

But suppose I were so far satisfied of the Roman Church, as to believe that it neither hath err'd for the time past, nor doth err at the present. Before I can be certain that this Note is inseparable to her, I must have very good assurance that she will not err for the time to come; and by what Argument can you assure me of that? Why, hath not our Saviour promised that the Gates of Hell shall never prevail against his true Church? And doth not this necessarily imply that his true Church shall never err? Suppose it doth; you ought to consider that I am now enquiring, whether the *Roman* Church be the true Church, or no? and consequently, whether this Promise belong to her, or no? and therefore as yet, neither this, nor any other Promise can be a sufficient Evidence to me, that this Note of not erring is inseparable to her for the future. The Church of *Rome* cannot deny but that there are several Churches now extant in the World, which for several Ages did not err, & yet now are erroneous; and therefore supposing that she hath not erred for these 1600 Years past, how can I thence conclude that she will not err hereafter? when she her self owns, that there are Churches now in being, which for 8 or 900 Years did not err, and yet have erred ever since? And what Reason can you give, why it should be more impossible for a Church to err after 1600 Years profession of the Truth, than after 900? Wherefore, before I can be certain that this Note of not erring is inseparable to any one Church now in being, I must have very good assurance not only that she doth not err at present, nor ever did, but also that she never will. But before I can be certain that she neither doth err, nor ever did, I must be next to infallible my self, and before I can be certain that she never will, I must be certain that she is infallible, because if her not erring for the future be a Contingency

gency that may or may not be, I can never be certain whether it will be or no. But it is impossible I should be sure that she is an infallible Church, before I am sure that she is the true Church; because if Infallibility be granted to any Church, it is agreed of all sides that it is only to the true Church: And therefore I must be certain which is the true Church, before I can be ascertained which Church is infallible. Seeing therefore, that every true Note is inseparable to the Thing which it notifies; before I can be certain that I have found the true Church, which Christ hath promised to continue to the end of the World, by this Note of not erring, I must have very good assurance, not only that my Church doth not err at present, but also that not to err is always inseparable to it, both for the time past, and the time to come: Seeing therefore there is no one Church now in being, of which we can be rationally assured as to this matter, the necessary Consequence is, that by this Note no Man can certainly discover which is the true Church. And now, having proved that according to the true Properties of the Notes of the true Church, this of *Sanctity of Doctrine*, as *Bellarmin* explains it, is no true Note for an honest Enquirer to seek the true Church by, I proceed,

III. To enquire in what Sense this is a true Note of the true Church. In short, if by *Sanctity of Doctrine*, we understand professing all the necessary and essential Articles of Christian Faith, and admitting all the essential parts of Christian Worship and Discipline, this wherever it is, is a certain Note of a true Church: for nothing can be a certain Note of a true Church, but what is essential to it as a true Church: for whatsoever

is accidental to it, is separable from it, and whatsoever is separable from it, it may have, or not have, and yet be a true Church; notwithstanding that therefore which doth not appertain to it, as it is a true Church, may appertain to a false Church, as well as a true: But to say that that is not a true Church, which hath all the essentials of a true Church, is a downright Contradiction. If therefore we would have such Notes of a true Church, as we may certainly depend upon, we must fetch 'em from the Essence of a true Church; and consequently we must first state what a true Church is, before we can be certain what are the true Notes of it. Now what it is that is necessary to constitute a true Christian Church, may be easily collected, by considering what is necessary to make a true Christian; for a true Christian Church, is nothing but a Society of true Christians. And seeing that Christianity consists of Doctrines of Faith, and Laws of Worship and Discipline, he only is a true Christian that owns and receives Christianity in all these parts of it; that is, who acknowledges all the Essentials of true Christian Faith, Worship and Discipline. And consequently that must be a true Christian Church, or Society of true Christians, which professes all the Essential Articles of Christian Faith, and receives all the Essential parts of Christian Worship and Discipline: whereever therefore I find a Religious Society of Men professing all the necessary Doctrines of true Christian Faith, worshipping the one God, through the one Mediator, communicating in the true Christian Sacraments, and submitting to the true Christian Discipline, duly administered by true Christian Pastors and Governours; there I am certain I have found a true Church, if that be a true Church
which

which hath all the Essentials that constitute a true Church. Wherefore before we can know whether this or that be a true Church, we must be rightly informed what a true Church is ; and before we can state what a true Church is, we must learn what the true Faith, and Worship, and Discipline is; because these are the Essential Ingredients of which a true Church is composed. And when we have learn'd what these are, by them we may certainly discover whether this or that be a true Church or no. If therefore by Sanctity of Doctrine, we understand the publick profession and admission of all the Essentials of Christian Faith, Worship, and Discipline ; it is not only a certain Note of a true Church, but the only certain Note of it : because there can be no certain Note of a true Church, but what is Essential to it, and there is nothing Essential to it, but what this Note comprehends. Where-ever this is, there is the entire Essence of a true Church; and if there were but one Church upon Earth that had it, that would be the only true Church in the World ; and if there were ten thousand Churches agreeing in it, there would be ten thousand true Churches. So that whereas all other Notes are separable from a true Church, and consequently, may direct us to a false Church, instead of a true ; this is no more separable from it, than a true Man is from the Human Nature : And if I had found a Church, that hath in it all the other Notes of *Bellarmin*, excepting this, I should still be to seek for a true Church ; as on the contrary, if I had found a Church that wants all the rest but this, I should nevertheless sit down fully satisfied of its Truth, and seek no further.

And thus I have given a brief Account, in what Sense Sanctity of Doctrine is a certain Note of the true Church,

and by this our Church is willing to be tryed by any honest and ingenuous Enquirer, whose Business it is to seek for Truth, and not for Gain and Preferment ; and if upon Examination, he cannot find in it (as I am sure he may if he examine fairly) all the Essentials of that Faith, and Worship, and Discipline which the Scripture teaches, and the Primitive Ages profess'd, and embraced, in God's Name, let him seek farther abroad ; but if after he hath missed of it in the Church of *England*, he should happen to find it in the Church of *Rome*, it imports him as much as his Soul is worth to enquire into one Point more, *viz.* whether he sought it by his Reason, or by his Interest. And now I proceed,

IV. And Lastly, To shew, That according to the Principles of the Church of *Rome*, the true Church is not to be found by this Note, in which-soever of the two Senses we understand it : for if by Sanctity of Doctrine we mean with *Bellarmin*, an unerring profession of the Truth, without any the least intermixture of Error, before we can be certain we have found the true Church by it, we must be very well assured concerning the profession of that Church, which we take to be the true Church, that it is in all particulars true, without any the least Ingredient of Error : Or if, by Sanctity of Doctrine, we only mean the profession of all the Essentials of Christian Faith, Worship, and Discipline, before we can be certain that we have found the true Church by it, we must be very well assured, not only that there are such Essential Principles, and what they are, but also that they are true ; for unless we certainly know that there are such Principles, and what they are, we can never be certain whether any one Church in the World doth
pro-

profess 'em or no: for how can we know whether or no a Church professes we know not what? And unless we certainly know that these Principles are true, we can never be certain whether that be a true Church which professes 'em; for seeing it is the profession of the true Principles of Religion that makes a true Church, it is impossible for us to know whether any Church be a true Church, till we know whether the Principles it professes are true. So that before a Man can be secure that he hath found the true Church, by this Note, he must be certain either that every thing it professes is true, or at least that the main and fundamental Principles of its Profession are true: Neither of which he can be certain of according to the Principles of the Church of *Rome*. For,

First, She decries Mens private Judgment of Discretion, as utterly insufficient to make any certain distinction of Truth from Falshood in matters of Religion.

Secondly, She allows no sufficient Rule, without the true Church, to guide and direct our private Judgment of Discretion.

Thirdly, She resolves all Certainty, as to matters of Faith, into the Authority of the true Church.

Fourthly, She authorizes the true Church to impose upon us an absolute necessity of believing such Things, as before were not necessary to be believed.

First,

First, The Church of *Rome* decries Men's private Judgment of Discretion, as utterly insufficient to make any certain distinction of Truth from Falshood, in matters of Religion: Seeing we are to seek the true Church by Notes, our certainty that we have found it, must wholly depend upon our certainty that we have found in it the Notes of the true Church: but tho there is no one thing in the World of which we are more concerned to be certain, than that we have found the true Church, and are in Communion with it, because no less than our Eternal Salvation depends upon it; yet it is only our own private Judgment of Discretion, that by applying the Notes of the true Church, can ascertain us in this Point: For while we are in quest of the true Church, we have no other way to find it, but by carrying the Notes of it along with us, and by examining and judging, by our own private Discretion, which Church these Notes do belong to; either our private Discretion is sufficient to ascertain us in this Matter, or it is not; if it be not, we can never be certain which is the true Church; if it be, it must be sufficient to ascertain us in all other necessary Points of Religion: because one of the Notes by which we are to seek the true Church, and that a principal one too, is Sanctity of Doctrine, or an unerring profession of the true Religion, at least in all necessary points. But before we can be certain which Church this Note belongs to, we must be thoroughly satisfied in our own private Discretion, what this unerring Profession is, which we can never be, till we are certain of the Truth of all the Particulars of it, and when we are certain of this, we are certain at least as to all necessary points of true Religion, which must all be included in every unerring

Pro-

Profession of it. So that before we can be certain of any Church, that it is the true Church, we must be certain that it doth not err in its profession; and before we can be certain of this, we must be certain of the Truth of all those particular Doctrines whereof its Profession is composed; and of this we have as yet no other way to be certain, but only by our own private Judgment of Discretion; because till we have found the true Church, its impossible we should conduct our selves by its Authority, and in the absence of the true Churches Authority, we have nothing to conduct us but our own private Discretion: either this our private Discretion therefore, is sufficient to ascertain us of the Truth of all the particular Doctrines, whereof an unerring Profession of Religion is composed, or it is not; if it be, it must be sufficient to ascertain us as to all necessary points of Religion; if it be not (as the Church of *Rome* affirms it is not) it is impossible we should ever be certain that we have found the true Church: again either therefore the Church of *Rome* must allow that certainty in all (at least in all necessary) Points of Religion, is attainable by the free and honest use of our own private Judgment of Discretion (which, as I shall shew by and by, she can never allow, without undermining her own Foundations); or she must leave Men hovering in eternal Uncertainty, as to one of the most necessary Points of Religion, *viz.* which is the true Church.

Secondly, The Church of *Rome* allows no sufficient Rule, without the true Church, to guide and direct our private Judgment of Discretion. Seeing the Constitution of the true Church is not natural, but entirely founded upon Divine Institution, this Question, Which
is

is the true Church? is not to be resolved by Principles of Nature, but by Principles of Revelation; and therefore, without some revealed Rule, which is every way sufficient to guide and direct our private Discretion, we shall never be able to find out which is the true Church; because without such a Rule we have nothing but the Principles of Nature to go by, which in this Enquiry are utterly insufficient to direct us. But while we are out of the Church, we have no other revealed Rule to direct us in our Enquiry after it, but only that of Scripture; for as for Tradition, the Church of *Rome* teaches that the true Church is the sole Conservator of it, and that tho it be a part of Divine Revelation, yet no Man is obliged any farther to believe it, than the true Church hath defined and declared it. And seeing I can have no certainty what is a true Tradition, till such time as I am got into the true Church, How can Tradition be a Rule of Faith to me, while I am out of it? Or, How can that be the Rule of my Faith, whilst I am in quest of the true Church, which I have no other Obligation to believe, but only the true Churches Authority? Whilst therefore I am out of the true Church, the only Rule I have to go by, in my Enquiries after it, is Scripture: And this the Church of *Rome* tells me is insufficient, both because it is not full enough, and because it is not clear enough. Which if true, I can never be certain I have found the true Church, by this Note of an unerring Profession.

1st. She teaches that the Scripture is not full enough, as not containing in it all necessary Doctrines of Faith, and Manners; but that there are certain unwritten Traditions in the Church, of equal Authority with it: by which its defects are supplied. And if so, How is it possible I should

should find the true Church by the direction of Scripture? For since, according to this Note, that can be no true Church, which doth not unerringly profess all necessary Doctrines of Faith, and Manners; when I have found a Church which professes all such necessary Doctrines, as are *in* Scripture, I cannot be secure that it is a true Church, supposing there are other necessary Doctrines *out* of Scripture, *viz.* in the unwritten Traditions; because then the profession of these will be altogether as necessary to its being a true Church, as the profession of those. All that the Scripture can satisfy me in, is only this, whether such a Church profess all the necessary Doctrines in Scripture? but if there are any necessary Doctrines out of Scripture, it's certain that the profession of them is as necessary to the being of the true Church, as the profession of those that are in it. And therefore, before I can be certain that it is the true Church, I must be fully satisfied that it professeth both, which I can never be, unless I have some other Rule to go by besides this of Scripture.

2dly. The Church of *Rome* teaches, that the Scripture is no sufficient Rule in respect of clearness, the Sense of it being so obscurely exprest, that we can never be certain what it is, without the Interpretation of the true Church: Which if true, it's utterly impossible for one, who is out of the true Church, ever to find it by the direction of Scripture. For according to this Note, that only is the true Church which doth not err in its Profession, at least in any necessary Point, either as to Doctrines of Faith, or Doctrines of Manners. But before I can know whether any Church doth not err in its Profession, I must be certainly informed what the true Profession is,

or what are those Doctrines of Faith, and Manners, of which this true Profession consists; as to which the Scripture can never certainly inform me, if it be not sufficiently clear. For if I can never be certain what the true sense of Scripture is, without the Interpretation of the true Church, How is it possible that while I am out of the true Church I should ever be certain of its Sense, as to all the particular Doctrines which the true Profession of Religion contains? So that according to this Principle, the Scripture is so far from being a sufficient Rule to one that is out of the true Church, that it is perfectly useless to him in his Enquiry after it: for either it can certainly direct him to the true Church, or it cannot; if it can, it must be sufficiently clear to inform him of its own Sense (without the Interpretation of the true Church); concerning all those Doctrines of Faith, and Manners, whereof the unerring Profession of the true Church is composed; and if so, this Principle of the *Roman* Church is erroneous; if it be not, to what purpose doth it serve, unless it be to lead him into an endless Maze of Uncertainties, wherein the further he wanders, the more he will lose himself? So that if a Man hath had the misfortune to be born and bred out of the true Church, in an Heretical or Schismatical Communion, and is enquiring his way *in*, by this Note of an unerring Profession, he hath no other Rule to instruct and inform him, what this unerring Profession is, but only that of Scripture; which according to the Principles of the Church of *Rome*, is insufficient for his Purpose. How then is it possible he should ever be certain that he hath found the true Church, when the only Rule he hath, whereby to en-

enquire what that unerring Profession is whereby he is to seek it, is utterly insufficient to resolve him?

Thirdly, The Church of *Rome* resolves all Certainty, as to matters of Faith, into the Authority of the true Church, and indeed this is the fundamental Principle of Popery, *viz.* That the only ground of Certainty, as to matters of Faith, is the Authority of the present true Church teaching and proposing 'em. Till such time therefore as we have found the true Church, and do believe upon the Authority of its teaching, we can never have any true Certainty of the matters which we are to believe. And yet before we can be certain that we have found the true Church, by this Note of an unerring Profession, we must have very good certainty as to all matters of Faith; for we can never be certain upon the Authority of any Church, that what we believe is true, till such time as we are certain that it is the true Church; nor can we ever be certain that it is the true Church, until we are certain that it doth not err in its Profession; or which is the same thing, that all the matters of Faith, which it teaches and professes, are true: So that the certainty of our Faith, after we have found the true Church, and do believe upon its Authority, must depend upon the certainty of our Faith while we were seeking it, and did believe without its Authority: Because before we can believe with any certainty, upon the Authority of any Church, we must be certain that it is the true Church; but we can never be certain that it is the true Church, till

we are first certain that its Profession is true, as to all the matters of Faith contained in it.

To make the matter more plain, I will briefly represent it in a short Dialogue between a Protestant and a Papist.

Protest. You tell me I can never be certain, as to matters of Faith, unless I believe upon the Authority of the true Church.

Pap. I do so; and upon the Truth of this Proposition all my Religion is founded.

Protest. But I beseech you, May I be certain as to matters of Faith, if I believe upon the Authority of any Church, tho I am not certain whether it be the true Church or no?

Pap. To what Purpose do you ask this Question?

Protest. Because, if I may, then in believing upon the Authority of the Church of *England*, which you say is a false Church, I shall be as certain as to matters of Faith, as you who believe on the Authority of the Church of *Rome*, which you say is the only true Church.

Pap. Why then I tell you, you can never be certain as to matters of Faith, in believing upon the Authority of any Church, unless you are certain it is the true Church upon whose Authority you believe 'em.

Protest.

Protest. Why so?

Pap. Because it is not the Authority of a Church merely that is the true ground of Certainty, but the Authority of the true Church; otherwise the Authority of all Churches, true or false, would be equally a true ground of Certainty: And therefore, you can never be certain that the Authority of that Church, upon which you believe, is a true ground of Certainty, unless you are first certain that it is the true Church.

Protest. I do allow your Reason. But then, pray, how shall I be certain that it is the true Church?

Pap. Why this you must examine by certain Notes of the true Church, whereof one (and that a principal one) is Sanctity of Doctrine, or an unerring Profession of the true Religion.

Protest. But, Good Sir, can I not be certain that it is the true Church, till I am first certain that it doth not err in its Profession?

Pap. No.

Protest. Why then I must be certain of the Truth of all those matters of Faith, whereof its Profession consists, before I can be certain that it is the true Church.

Pap. You must so.

Protest.

Protest. But, pray, how shall I? If that be true which you told me just now, *viz.* That there is no true ground of Certainty, but the Authority of the true Church: For how is it possible I should ever be truly certain, when as yet I know no true ground of Certainty?

Pap. Why have you not the Authority of the true Church?

Protest. But as yet I am not certain that the Church, upon whose Authority you would have me believe, is the true Church; and till I am certain of this, with what Certainty can I depend upon her Authority? Would you have me be certain that whatsoever she professes is true, upon her own bare Word and Authority, before I am certain that she is the true Church? If so why may I not as well believe any other Church to be the true Church, seeing there is no other Church but what will pass its Word for the Truth of its own Profession, as well as yours? If not, you must allow me to have some other ground of Certainty, as to Matters of Faith, besides the Authority of the true Church. For before I can securely rely upon the Authority of any Church, as the true ground of Certainty, I must be certain that it is the true Church, and my Certainty that she is the true Church, must depend upon my Certainty of the Truth of all those Matters of Faith comprised in her Profession. So that before I am certain of the Truth of her Profession,

on,

on, it is too soon for me to rely upon her Authority, as the only ground of Certainty; and when I am certain of it, it is too late, because I am certain already.

Fourthly. And Lastly, The Church of *Rome* gives Authority to the true Church, to impose upon Mens Minds a necessity of believing such things as, before, they were not obliged to believe: For she makes the Church's Authority not only a concurrent motive of Faith, but the very formal reason of it, so that we are not only obliged to believe what the Church declares, but we are therefore obliged to believe it, because she declares it. 'Tis true, some of the Roman Doctors tell us that the Church hath no power to make new Articles of Faith, but only, that seeing there some old Truths in Scripture, and the unwritten Tradition of the Church, which the Church hath not yet declared, and which therefore Men are not yet obliged to believe; the Church hath Authority when ever she thinks meet to declare 'em, and thereby to oblige Men, under pain of Damnation to believe 'em; but others of 'em and (particularly Cardinal *Bellarmin de Potest. Sum. Pontif.*) tell us, *That the Church of latter Time not only hath power to explain and declare, but also to Constitute and Command those Things which belong to Faith.* And indeed the difference between declaring and constituting, or making an Article of Faith, is only Verbal: For an Article of Faith is a Truth that is necessary to be believed. And therefore, if the Church by declaring a Truth which was not necessary to be believed, makes,

makes it necessary to be believed, it thereby makes that Truth an Article of Faith, which was not an Article of Faith. And so to declare, and to make, is the very same thing. But in this they are all agreed, that the true Church hath power to make those things necessary to be believed which were not so before. And if this be true, no Man can ever be certain, by this Note of an unerring Profession, that he hath found the true Church. For before I can be certain of any Church (as, for instance, the *Roman*) that it is the true Church, I must be certain that that Church's Profession is true; but when I proceed to examine the particular Articles of it (as I must do before I can be certain of the Truth of the whole) I shall find there are several of them, of the Truth of which in the opinion of several (even of her own Doctors) I have no sufficient ground to be certain, either in Scripture, or Tradition (which while I am seeking the true Church, are the only Rule I have whereby to examine them) as particularly, Transubstantiation, Seven Sacraments, Necessity of Auricular Confession, Roman Purgatory, and Indulgences. *Vid.* Note the Sixth, *pag.* 125. &c. And if these Roman Doctors pretend to be certain of them, upon no other Reason, but because their Church (which they are sure is the true Church) hath declared them. How shall I be certain of them, who am but an Enquirer, whether it be the true Church or no? And therefore as yet cannot be supposed to be sure that it is; for without her Declaration, they themselves confess, I
have

have no sufficient ground to be certain of the Truth of them: And till I am sure she is the true Church, her Declarations are no ground of Certainty to me. And as I cannot be certain that these Articles are true, till I am sure that the Church which declare them is the true Church; so supposing that the true Church hath power to impose upon me a necessity of believing such Things, as before I was not obliged to believe, I cannot be certain that they are false; because no Authority can be supposed to have a right to impose upon Men such a necessity of believing, but what is infallible, and cannot impose what is false on them; unless it be supposed that Men may be rightfully obliged to believe what is false. If therefore the Roman Church be the true Church, (as for all I yet know it may); then for all I yet know it hath Authority from God to impose upon me a necessity of believing whatever she declares; and consequently for all I yet know she is Infallible. But as for my self I know that I am a fallible Creature, and therefore whatsoever Infallibility declares to me must certainly be true, whatsoever Probabilities, yea, or seeming Demonstrations I may have against it; how then can I be certain that any Article is false which is declared to me by a Church, that for all I yet know is Infallible? if it be Infallible, I am sure that whatever it declares is true: And if it be the true Church, it must be Infallible. Supposing that the true Church hath Authority to impose new Necessities of believing, but whether it be the true Church or no, is

the Thing I am now enquiring by this Note of an unerring Profession? But till I am certain one way or t'other, whether she be the true Church or no? I can never be certain whether her Profession be true or false; till I am certain that she is the true Church, there are some Articles in her Profession, of which (as her own Doctors confess) I cannot be certain that they are true; and till I am certain that she is not the true Church, I can never be certain that any one Article in her Profession is false; and if I cannot be certain whether she errs in her Profession or no, till I am certain whether she be the true Church or no, to what purpose should I enquire whether or no she be the true Church, by this Note of an unerring Profession? If supposing her to be the true Church, she hath Authority from God to oblige me upon pain of Damnation to believe to Day that which I was not obliged to believe Yesterday; to what end do I enquire whether those things which she commands me to believe, are true or false? If she be the true Church, (as for all I yet know she may be) I am sure what ever she commands me to believe must be true; and therefore till I am certain that she is not the true Church, I can never be certain that any thing she commands me to believe is false: For how can I be certain that any one thing she imposes is false, when for all I yet know, she is the true Church, which the God of Truth (who can neither impose himself, nor authorize any other to impose on me that which

which is false) hath authorized to impose it? and if till I am certain that she is not the true Church, I can never be certain that any thing she imposes is false; How can I ever be certain, by this Note of an unerring Profession, whether she be the true Church or no? For if any thing she professes or imposes be false, by this Note, she cannot be the true Church; but whether any thing she professes be false or no, I can never be certain, till I am first certain, whether she is, or is not the true Church.

T H E E N D.

E R R A T A.

IN the Seventh Note, Pag. 137. the first *cum Capite*, in the Title, is to be blotted out. P. 147. line 17. for *Arian*, r. *Asian*. P. 148. l. 6. f. *Complaint*, r. *Complement*.

L O N D O N,

Printed by J. D. for Richard Chiswel at the Rose and Crown in
St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1687.

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

The Ninth Note of the CHURCH EXAMINED,

VIZ,

The Efficacy of the Doctrine.

Nona Nota est Efficacia Doctrinae. Bellarm. L. iv. c. 12.
de Notis Ecclesiæ.

I M P R I M A T U R.

June 8. 1687.

Jo. Battely.

BY Efficacy of Doctrine, must be meant either that power which the Word of God has in the Minds of Particular Men to dispose them to believe aright, and to live well; or else that success which it has in drawing Multitudes outwardly to profess and embrace it. The former of these is too inward a thing to be the Note of a true Church. No Man being able to know what the Word of God has done in anothers Heart, but instead of that apt rather to be deceived in what it has done in his own.

The Second (which must be that the Cardinal means) can as little be a Note, by reason of its Uncertainty; and if we cannot be sure of the Note, we shall be less so of that, which we are to find out by it. If indeed
F f there

Lib. iv. 2.

there were nothing which could or did move Men to relinquish Heathenism, Judaism or Turcism for our Religion, but the pure Efficacy of the Christian Doctrine, it would be a very good Note of the excellence of the Doctrine it self; but, according to the Cardinal's own Principles, it could be no Note that that were the true Church which preached it, since he will not allow *the sincere preaching of Truth* to signify any thing. And we shall have much less reason to rely on this Note, if we consider how many other things there are besides the Efficacy of the Christian Doctrine, which have and may convert whole Nations to it.

Pastoral Letter
P. 2, 4.

Let us therefore at present grant in general the matter of Fact to be true, that such Conversions as the Cardinal speaks of were made by the Church of *Rome*; yet how shall we know that they were made purely by the Efficacy of its Doctrine, and that no other means, such as Force, &c. were used? Is it enough that he tells us so? The Bishop of *Meaux* tells us, that in the late great Conversion in *France*, not one of the Persons converted *suffered Violence, either in his Person or Goods; That they were so far from suffering Torments, that they had not so much as heard them mentioned; and that he heard other Bishops affirm the same.* Now if those Reverend Prelats were out (as most people think they were) in a matter of Fact, of which they might be Eye-witnesses; why may not the learned Cardinal be so too in his Relation of Conversions, made so many hundred years since? If he be out, his Note falls to the ground: and if it cannot be made plainly to appear to us, that he was not out, his Note, as far as it is founded upon those Histories which he produces wants that certainty, which should give us satisfaction. Historians who wrote in those obscure times, and were perhaps themselves Con-
verters,

verters, being most of them Monks, might vain-gloriously ascribe much to the Efficacy of their own Doctrine; and the *Centuriators* themselves, whom he so often quotes, might not be very curious to search, or accurate to relate the chief motives of their Conversions, because they wrote before the Cardinal had made *Efficacy of Doctrine* a Note of the true Church, and little dream't what odd use some Men would make of their History. But notwithstanding these Neglects and Disadvantages, I do not doubt, but that if we look'd back into the Writers of those Times, nay even into the *Centuriators* themselves, we should find some other things besides Efficacy of Doctrine concurring to the Conversions which were then wrought. An instance whereof (to pass by at present the particular examination of those mentioned by the Cardinal) we have in those Conversions wrought by *Charles* the Great, to whose victorious Arms they weremore to be ascribed than to any thing else besides. For (not to mention that the Clergy were not then in any great capacity of doing much by the Efficacy of their Doctrine, the Bishops being so ignorant, that they were to be commanded to understand the Lord's Prayer, and could hardly be brought to make some few exhortations to the People, but instead of that turned Souldiers, to shew that they were willing to do somewhat towards the propagating their Religion) such was the Zeal of that Prince rather to *defend and increase the Kingdom of Jesus Christ, than to enlarge his own Empire*; that Peace could never be obtained of him upon other Terms, than that those who were conquered by him, having left their Idol-worship, should embrace the true, sincere and eternal Religion of Christ. And to engage them to continue firm to it, he sometimes took Hostages of them, and finding them begin to apostatize (which they as

*Mexeray in the
Life of Charles
the Great.*

*Krantzius Præf.
ad Metrop.*

The Ninth Note of the Church,

often did, as they thought themselves able to make head against their Conquerors) he was forc'd to set up a kind of Inquisition to keep them in aw, which *Mezeray* tells us lasted in *Westphalia* till the 15th Century. Now when the Swords of victorious Princes, as it happened in this case, had made way for the preaching of the Gospel; when the receiving of it was often made one of the Terms they who were conquered must necessarily submit to, the Monks had very easy work; what-ever Doctrine they had preached might have been efficacious under such Circumstances. So that when there is with the Christian Doctrine a concurrence of many other things which have so strong an influence upon humane Nature, 'tis hard, nay impossible for us to know which of them does the work. When different Medicines proper for the same Distemper are administred at the same time, 'tis not easy to say which of them works the Cure.

There is indeed a wonderful Efficacy in the Christian Doctrine: but we can never be sure that the Conversion of a Nation is effected by that, when Hopes, and Fears, and outward Force, and necessity are in conjunction with it.

All which is so far from detracting from the honour of our Religion, and the Conversions it made in the Primitive Times, that it sets in it a better Light, and makes it shine the brighter. Men were converted then, not to a conquering, but persecuted Church. The Secular Power was against them that preached this holy Doctrine: Much might be lost, and nothing in this World got by it. There were no rewards to encourage Men to receive it, but a thousand Difficulties and Dangers to deter them from it. And then indeed the Efficacy of the Christian Doctrine was in its greatest lustre;

it wrought all alone, and had nothing to put in with it for a share in the Conquests it made: The simplicity of its Preachers cleared them from all suspicion of Fraud. The little or no Interest they had in the Government, makes it plain, that they could not use force; and every thing concurred to demonstrate that 'twas purely the Efficacy of their Doctrine by which they prevailed. But, to proceed a little more particularly to answer what the Cardinal has discoursed upon this Subject,

First, I shall endeavour to shew in the general, That the Prevalency of any Doctrine can be no Note of a true Church.

Secondly, I shall instance in such particulars, as do more particularly affect the Church of *Rome* in this matter, and do make it evident that the Prevalency of the Doctrine, professed in that Church, is no Note of its being a true Church.

Thirdly, I shall shew the Insufficiency of those Arguments, with which the Cardinal endeavours to prove the contrary.

First, That the Prevalency of any Doctrine can be no Note of a true Church, will appear, if we consider,

1. What our Saviour has said in this matter.
2. The Nature of Mankind.
3. Matter of Fact.

1. Altho our Saviour sufficiently understood how much his Doctrine was likely to prevail in the World, yet he is so far from making this to be a Note of his Church, that he gives as plain intimations of the Prevalency of Error, and does often bid us take care how we are imposed upon

on thereby. *Take heed, saith he, that no man deceive you; for many shall come in my Name, saying, I am Christ, and deceive many: For there shall arise false Christs, and false Prophets, and shall shew great Signs and Wonders, in-somuch that (if it were possible) they shall deceive the very Elect.* When he foretells so general a Defection, he cannot be supposed to have thought the prevalency of any Doctrine to have been the Character of his true Disciples. He does indeed compare the preaching of his Gospel to a *grain of Mustard-seed, which is the least of all Seeds, but when it is grown, it is the greatest among Herbs, unto Leaven which leaveneth the whole Lump; unto a Net which gathereth of every kind.* All which Comparisons do intimate how much his Church would spread far & near: but not that such its diffusiveness was to be relied upon as a Note whereby to find it; for by that Mark it could not then have been found when it was but a little Flock. Besides that, in the same Chapter, he compares likewise the preaching of his Gospel to a *Man which sowed good Seed in his Field; but while Men slept, his Enemy came and sowed Tares among the Wheat, and went his way; but when the Blade was sprung up, and brought forth fruit, then appeared the Tares also.* In which case if we were to judge by the growth and spreading, we might conclude the Tares to have been the best Seed, and not sown by an Enemy. He compares likewise the Ministers of his Word, to the Servants of a certain King, sent out by him to call those that were bidden to the Wedding, but to no purpose, *for they all made light of it.* Intimating hereby, how possible it is for those who are obstinate not to hearken to the most efficacious Doctrine that can be preached, the most passionate and earnest invitations which can be made them. And in the Parable of the good Seed, some of which fell by the way-side, some upon stony

Mat. 24. 4. 5.

Verse 24.

Verse 24, 25,
26.

Mat. 22. 2. &c.

stony places, some among Thorns, and other upon good Ground; He does plainly set forth, that let any Doctrine be never so good, the reception which it finds in the World, will be no other than what is agreeable to those Dispositions of mind which it happens to meet with. And here also, if the Rule had been, that that is the true Doctrine which grows fastest and out-tops the other, we must have given it for the Thorns, which grew up and choaked the good Seed. Which leads me to shew,

2. From the consideration of the Temper and constitution of Mankind, how weak a proof of a true Church, the prevalency of any Doctrine is which it teacheth. For Mens minds are so uncertain, by reason of the Inconstancy of their Circumstances, which chiefly influence them, that often Truth is shut out, where Error finds an easy admission. Humane Nature is so weak a thing, so apt to take impressions, first from this thing, then from another, that no great heed is to be given to its changes; no certain Argument can be drawn from them. Such indeed is the Power of Truth, that were Mankind freed from their Prejudices against it, were their Minds no way byassed by Interest or Passion, and at the same time fully instructed concerning it, there is no doubt to be made, but that it would generally obtain. But when Mens Inclinations and Circumstances are so various, nothing is more manifest, than that the receiving, or rejecting Truth, is a thing too uncertain to be made an infallible Note of it. When it is argued on behalf of Christianity, that so many thousands were on the suddain converted to the Faith: the force of such an Argument does not lie in the bare prevalency of the Doctrine, but in its prevalency when placed in such Circumstances as it at the first preaching of the Gospel was; and when Men of mean birth and education (as
has

has already been observed) did without force or fraud on the suddain make so many profelytes to a Religion, which was so directly contrary to those Opinions to which the World had been so long accustomed, a Religion which was likely to bring such great Inconveniences upon those who embraced it: This indeed was very remarkable, and could be ascribed to nothing but the Power of Truth, which was only able to bring about so wonderful an Effect. In a word, Men being oftner guided by Fancy, Prejudice, and Interest, than by Reason makes them more capable of Error than of Truth; and when they have once received it, not only unwilling to part with it, but zealous to propagate it as much as they can. The Agreeableness of any Doctrine to their wicked Lusts and Affections, is most likely to win upon them. The craft and cunning of those who lie in wait to deceive, may easily mislead unstable Minds into gross Mistakes before they are aware; ~~and since Truth~~ Force, the enjoyment of present Preferment, or the hopes of it, may make them profess what they do not believe to be true, and then seek for Reasons to defend it. Since then there are so many things beside Truth, which may induce Men to admit any Doctrine, the bare admitting of it, tho never so universally, can be no Note of the Truth of that, or of the Church that teaches it. God has endued us with a capacity of finding out Truth, but at the same time he has made us fallible Creatures, and liable to be imposed upon; so that it stands us in hand to be aware, how we are deceived; and the more care we take in a concern of this Nature, the more we discover our own Sincerity and Zeal for Truth. But let there be never such clear Discoveries thereof, it is in our power wilfully to shut our Eyes against them; nay when we have adhered to Truth for some time, we may
be

be tempted either wholly to forsake it, or to intermingle gross Errors with it. So that it is as improper to conclude the prevalency of any Doctrine to be an Argument of the Truth of it, or of the Church that professeth it; as that any Cause is just because successful. Such is God's infinite Wisdom and Goodness, that as he does oftentimes bless with unexpected Success an honest and just Design, and they who are sagacious in tracing the Footsteps of Providence, do easily discover it; so does he likewise frequently exert his Power after an extraordinary manner for the propagation of Truth. But on the other hand, as he often permits an unjust Design to prevail and prosper, so likewise does he suffer Error to multiply and increase. And when he does at any time exert his Power after an extraordinary manner, for the propagation of Truth, he still deals with Men as with Rational Creatures; so that such his Power may be resisted, nay, may be so far resisted, as may make him punish with Infatuation such their Resistance; as he served the Pharisees upon the account of their Obstinacy, *whose Eyes he blinded, and whose Heart he hardened, that they should not see with their Eyes, nor understand with their Heart, and be converted.* And as happened to those whom the Apostle makes mention of, whom because *they received not the love of Truth that they might be saved, God sent strong Delusions, that they might believe a Lie.* Since therefore such is the Temper and Constitution of Mankind, as to be daily subject to Errors, and to be liable, by the just Judgment of God, to be at last hardened in them, nothing can with any certainty be determined concerning the Truth of any Church from the Prevalency of any Doctrine professed in it.

John 12. 40,
41.

2 Thess. 2. 10,
11.

3. Plain Matter of Fact shews the Insufficiency of this Note. For the Histories of all Ages make it evi-

dent what an influence Error has often had upon Mens Minds; and that altho Truth may have happened sometimes to have prevailed, yet that it has been as often refused, and gross and most impious Opinions preferr'd before it. How soon were our first Parents, when their Minds were in their greatest strength and vigor, and not as yet biaſſed by any Miſapprehenſions of things, by the cunning Artifices of Satan tempted to believe a Lie? After which first and grand Miſtake, how did their whole Stock degenerate, when *every Imagination of Man's Heart being evil, it repented the Lord that he had made Man on the Earth.* Afterward God choſe to himſelf out of the reſt of the World a peculiar People, and to ſecure them againſt the Idolatry and Superſtition of thoſe who dwelt near them, he gave them particular Statutes, which by Threats, and Promiſes, and mighty Wonders which he wrought for them, he obliged them to obſerve. Yet how ſoon did they forget God, and turned after Idols? So that in the time of *Ahab*, according to God's own account, there were but 7000 who had not bowed unto *Baal*. If the Efficacy of the Doctrine had been a Note of the true Church, I do not ſee why the Priests of *Baal* had not as much reaſon at that time to have inſiſted upon it, as the *Romiſh* Priests can have now. At our Saviour's coming the *Phariſees* had infected the whole Nation with their Traditions, and ſo obſtinately did they adhere to them, that notwithstanding the many Miracles which our Saviour had wrought for them, notwithstanding the Holineſs of his Life and Converſation, few believed on him, according to the Propheſy of *Iſaiah*, made mention of *Joh. 12. 38. Lord, who hath believed our Report?* of which our Saviour himſelf complains *John 5. 43. I am come in my Father's Name, and ye receive me not: if another ſhall come in his own Name, him ye will receive.* And in the 11th of *St. Matthew*,

Gen. 3. 5, 6.

Gen. 6. 5, 6.

them, ver. 20, &c. he does most severely upbraid the Cities, wherein most of his mighty Works were done, because they repented not: And does openly declare, that it would be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of Judgment, than for them. If any Doctrine was likely to have been efficacious, one would have thought the Doctrine of our Saviour, when taught by himself, had been so; and yet we find that no Prophet was ever less respected than he was, even among his own Country-men. The same thing happened likewise to St. Paul, as we read, *Acts* 13.45. and *Act.* 28.24, &c. After Christianity had for above 300 Years been struggling to get ground in the World, how strangely did Arianism on the sudden prevail against it? One would have thought, that after People had for some time been confirmed in the Truth, they should not have been easily tempted to embrace so gross an Error. But yet such was the Efficacy of this Heresy, that as *Theodoret* relates, the Emperour *Constantius* in a Discourse with *Liberius* Bishop of Rome, urgeth it as an Argument against his Intercession on behalf of *Athanasius*; Pray, saith he, how big a part of the World are you, that you alone pretend to stand up for a wicked Man (so he called *Athanasius*) and to disturb the Peace of the whole World? Which the Bishop was so far from thinking a good Argument, that he immediately replied. The true Faith loseth nothing by my being alone; for there were formerly but three found who resisted the King's Commandment. Neither did the same Heresy prevail only at home amongst the Orthodox Christians, but was likewise victorious abroad amongst the Idolatrous Nations, of which the same Author gives us a notable Instance, when he tells us that one *Ulphilas*, a Bishop of great Authority amongst the *Goths*, being corrupted by *Eudoxius*,

*Theod. lib. 2.
Hist. Eccl. c. 16.*

Dan. 3. 18.

*Theod. lib. 4.
c. ult.*

Paulus Æmyl.
l. 2. de gestis
Francorum.
Calvis. Chro-
nol. ab Ann.
631, ad An.
718.

Brerewood's
Inquiries c. 14.

perswaded that whole Nation to embrace it. About 300 Years after so general a defection from the true Faith by Arianism the Impostor *Mahomet* arose, whose Doctrine, in the space of an hundred Years, over-run a great part both of the East and South, and did continue so far to prevail, that when *Brerewood* made the Computation of such as had received it, he reckons them to be six parts of thirty (into which he supposeth the whole World to be divided) whereas he allots but five parts to the whole number of Christians, of what denomination soever. As to this Particular the Cardinal urgeth that Mahometanism is propagated by Force of Arms, and not by the Efficacy of its Doctrine. In answer to which Assertion, (besides that the World is not ignorant how little reason the Cardinal had to make this Objection, and that *Mahomet* must have first converted those by his Doctrine, whom he afterwards made use of to convert others by Force) I shall set down this remarkable Instance, whereby it will manifestly appear how much the Mahometan Missionaries, even without the assistance of any outward Force, may sometimes prove too hard for the *Roman* Ones. *Bati* King of the *Tartars*, having wasted the Christian Territories, returns into *Scythia*, leaving all *Europe* in a great Consternation. Pope *Innocent* the 4th in the Year 1246, from the Council of *Lions*, sends a company of Religious Men a long Journey to him, to exhort him to worship the one living and true God, and his only Son Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the World, and to abstain from shedding Christian Blood. When the *Tartar* had heard the Pope's Request, he promised for five Years not to trouble the Christians. But as soon as the Pope's Messengers were gone, some *Saracens* came exhorting the *Tartars* to embrace the Mahometan Sect rather than Christi-

Christianity, and what they said had such Effect, especially upon the Emperour, that they embrac'd Mahometanism, and keep to it still. In this case the two Doctrines had very fair play ; for the *Tartars* were prejudic'd on neither side, neither could any Force be made use of to compel them to receive one Doctrine more than the other. If either had the advantage, it was that of the Romish Church ; for that had got the start, but was soon wholly rejected ; and the other has ever since been embraced.

Were not those Instances which I have mention'd sufficient to shew what little Judgment can be made of the Truth of any Church from the Reception which its Doctrine has met with in the World, I might here add the Conversions wrought by those of the *Greek Church*, whom the Church of *Rome* accounts Hereticks. *Frumentius*, sent by *Athanasius*, converted the *Indians* ; *Moses*, an *Alexandrian Monk*, the *Saracens*. And concerning the Conversion of the *Moscovites*, *Paulus Jovius* thus speaks : *Above five hundred Years since*, says he, *the Moscovites worship'd the Heathen Gods, Jupiter, &c.* De Legatione Moscovit. *but then were they first initiated in the Christian Rites, when the Greek Bishops out of an inconstant temper began to dissent from the Latin Church, and it so happened, that the Moscovites in the same sense, and with a most hearty Belief followed those Religious Rites which they had received from their Greek Teachers.* I might likewise make mention of the great Efficacy of the Reformed Doctrine, which in the space of fifty Years, when Bishop *Jewel* set out the Defence of his Apology, notwithstanding the great Opposition which had been made against it, had over-run whole Nations, and mightily prevailed even in those Kingdoms where the Princes and Governours were still Popish. The distinction which *Bellarmin* makes,

Defence of Apol.
p. 36.

Bell. de Not.
l. 4. c. 12.

makes, that *Hereticks do not convert Men to the true Faith, and that the Goths were cheated into Arianism, That they pervert Catholicks* is nothing to the purpose: For if by Hereticks Men may be converted or cheated into what is false; if Catholicks may be so easily perverted; then the Effect which any Doctrine has upon Mens Minds can be no Note of their being Members of a true Church who profess it. If the Doctrine which they who are converted have received, be a true Doctrine, this indeed is a good Note of a true Church, and we are willing to stand and fall by it; but their bare Conversion is no Note at all, because as to its being received, or not received, Error has had the same fate in the World as Truth it self has had. And of this the Cardinal himself was enough sensible, who having forgot what he had made to be the ninth Note of the Church, does repeat in an Oration at the end of his Controversies this Objection of the Reformists: *How is it possible (say they) that that Doctrine should not be from God, which in so short time has over-run so many People, Provinces, and Kingdoms?* And then makes this Answer, *If it be lawful to philosophise after this manner, we shall have much more reason to wonder why the Alcoran of Mahomet in so great a part of the World has so easily prevailed.*

Orat. in
Scholis habita.
edit. In. 8^o.
Inq. 1593.

Having thus in the general shewn that Efficacy of Doctrine can be no Note of a true Church, it necessarily follows, that the Efficacy of the Doctrine professed in the Church of *Rome*, can be no Note of its being so. But yet, that I may further shew what little reason that Church of all others has to pretend that it is the Character of its being a true Church; I desire in the second place, that these following Particulars may be considered.

I. That

1. That altho we charge the Church of *Rome* with many Errors and Mistakes, yet we allow it to contain in it a mixture of Truth. Now this very mixture of Truth may perhaps be of sufficient force to make Profelytes; but then it does not follow, but that such Profelytes may likewise have embraced the Errors which are mixed with it, as well as the Truth it self. The *Indians* (whose Conversion to the Romish Faith I shall speak of afterwards) were not so void of Reason, but that if they compared the Religion of their Conquerors with their own Worship, they might be perswaded to embrace the former, rather than adhere still to the latter. And altho by this means they were but half converted to the Truth, yet it was better that it should be thus, than that they should not have been converted at all; for by this means they were much nearer the reception of the whole Truth than they were formerly, which was a great advantage; and therefore we reckon those but an ill sort of Protestants, who would rather have Men Turks and Infidels than of the Romish Church. But at the same time the Conversion of never so many to Church of *Rome*, is no Argument of its not being a corrupted Church, as long as we can prove it to maintain such gross Errors as it does, altho accompanied with such a mixture of Truth, as may be of great force to bring over such as had before little or no knowledg thereof.

2. That the Prevalency of the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* can be no Note of its being a true Church, because it is so much alter'd from what it formerly was. The Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* was in the beginning of Christianity, the same with that which was deliver'd by Christ and his Apostles to the Saints. Afterwards new Doctrines insensibly crept into, and were

Barrow of the
Pope's Suprem.
Discourse of
Transubst. Disc.
concerning the
Worship of the
blessed Virgin
and the Saints.
Disc. of Communion
in one kind.
Vindicat. of the
Answ. to some
late Papers, &c.

were received by that Church, and at last Matters came to be settled as we now find them in the Council of *Trent*. This has been often cleared by Learned Men, and in some of those Discourses which have of late been writ, some of the new Doctrines have been traced step by step, and the manner how they came to be receiv'd set down; and in others the Church of *Rome* has been compared with her self, and what was determin'd by the Council of *Trent*, has been shown to be quite another thing from what was held some Ages ago. Now it is impossible that things that are different should be the distinguishing Character of that which is always the same. Since then I suppose it will be readily granted, that the Church of *Rome* has always been the true Church, the Efficacy of its Doctrine can be no Note thereof, since in some Ages those Doctrines have prevailed in it, which are directly contrary to those which have prevailed in other.

3. That the Prevalency of any Doctrine can be no Note of a true Church, where those who embrace it are hindered from thoroughly examining it. For without a thorough Examination it never can be rightly understood; and what Efficacy can it have upon his Mind who does not rightly understand it? Now the Church of *Rome* exacts of the Members of her Communion a tame Submission to, and Compliance with whatever she proposeth to their Belief and Practice: and by forbidding them the use of the Scriptures, she takes from them the use of that Rule, whereby they are to judge of the Reasonableness of her Proposals. How then can the reception of her Doctrine be a Note of her being a true Church, when perhaps not one amongst a thousand of her Members who receive it, is capable of understanding what he is bound to believe?

4. That

4. That the Prevalency of any Doctrine can be no Note of a true Church, where Art and Force are made use of to make it prevail. For it is no difficult matter for cunning Deceivers to impose upon unstable Souls; and it must be a great courage and constancy of Mind, which can make Men for-go Father and Mother, Houses and Land, &c. for the sake of Truth. Now that the Church of Rome has taken this course to propagate her Doctrines, we may be assured by some of her own Members: *There are, saith Erasmus, those who after a new Example make Christians by force, but whilst they pretend the Propagation of Religion, they do in reality study the Enlargement of Riches and Power. Not unlike these are those Monks who inveigle others to take upon them their Order, and do use a great deal of cunning to ensnare such as are young and unskilful, and who neither understand Themselves, nor the Nature of true Religion. And Stapleton declares very freely, Eo sane loco hereses sunt, &c. Heresies are come to that pass, that their Gordian Knots are not to be dissolved by Art and Industry, but by the Sword of Alexander; and the Club of Hercules is more fit to subdue them than the Harp of Apollo.* I might quote several others to the same purpose; but the constant Practices of the Inquisition in those places where it is received, and the extraordinary Methods which have of late been made use of in a Neighbouring Nation to gain Profelytes, do sufficiently shew that the Church of Rome does more depend upon something else, than upon the Efficacy of her Doctrine for the making of Converts: Which will more fully appear, if in the third place we consider the insufficiency of the Cardinal's Arguments, which are fetched,

Erasmus in Annot. in Mat. 23.

Stapleton Epist. Dedic. de oper. Justific. Edit. Paris 1582.

First, From the Scriptures.

Secondly, From what happened in the beginning of the Christian Church.

Thirdly, From the particular Instances which he gives of Conversions wrought by those of the Church of Rome.

First; As to the Scriptures which are quoted, *Pf. 19. 7. The Law of the Lord is perfect, converting the Soul: and Heb. 4. 12. For the Word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged Sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of Soul and Spirit, and of the Joints and Marrow, and is a discernor of the Thoughts and Intents of the Heart.* It may be answer'd,

1. That the latter of these is by several Expositors interpreted of the Son of God, and not of his Doctrine.

2. That if they are both interpreted of the Efficacy of any Doctrine; yet that the Efficacy which is spoken of is wholly internal, as we before observ'd, and consequently such as cannot be accounted a Note of the true Church. For the Note of a Church must be what any one can come to the knowledge of.

3. Suppose by these words was to be understood the visible Prevalency of any Doctrine in the World, yet it would make nothing to the Cardinal's purpose. For that which in these SS. is said to prevail, is, *The Word of God, The Law of the Lord*, i. e. the true Doctrine. But we deny the Doctrine of the Church of Rome to be such; and therefore these places are not applicable thereunto.

4. Were

4. Were these SS. applicable to the Church of *Rome*, as having that true Doctrine which is oftentimes so efficacious, yet the Efficacy here expressed could be no Note of the true Church; since altho (as has already been shewn) the true Doctrine does sometimes prevail, yet it does not follow, that it always should: For it may be perverted, it may be resisted, and Error may meet with a much kinder Reception in the World than it does.

As for what *Bellarmino* saith in the second place, concerning the Prevalency of the Christian Doctrine in the beginning of the Church, we allow it all to be true; but we do not think the Church of *Rome* to be more concerned in it, than any other Christian Church whatsoever. What then happened does very much confirm the Christian Doctrine in the general, but does not at all prove any particular party of Christians to be better than another, much less the Church of *Rome*, whose Doctrine, altho it was once the same with the Doctrine of the Primitive Church, yet what it was in the Cardinal's days, and what it is now, is quite another thing from what it was then. The Primitive Christians converted the Heathens from their Idolatry to worship the true God; but the great design of the Catholick Missionaries is, to render their Profelytes intirely submissive to the Pope of *Rome* in all things.

I might here conclude, did not the Cardinal much insist upon the particular Conversions wrought by those of the Church of *Rome*, upon some of which, in the third place, I shall make some brief Reflections.

Now as to the Conversion of the *English* by *Augustin* the Monk, it may be replied,

H h 2

1. That

1. That the Centurists (out of whom he quotes this and the other Instances) do expressly say, that *Augustin, eas Ecclesias magis deformavit quam recte instituit.*

Cent. 6. c. 2.
p. 37.

2. That this was not such a general Conversion as seems to be pretended: for (as has been lately cleared by a very learned Man) the Faith was here planted during the Apostles times, and in all probability by St. Paul rather than by St. Peter, or any one else. Besides Bede gives us an account of *Germanus, Lupus*, and *Severus*, coming over hither to reclaim the *Britains* from the Heresie of *Pelagius* several Years before the arrival of *Augustin*, and that at his coming over several *British* Bishops met him at *Augustinsac*, and stoutly refused all Submission, either to the Church of *Rome*, or to him. Lastly, altho he might be very instrumental towards the Conversion of the *Saxons* in *Kent*, yet was he even in that Affair mightily assisted by the Authority of a Christian Queen named *Bertha*, and a Christian Bishop named *Luidhardus*.

Dr. Still. Ori-
gin. Britan. c. 1.

Bed. l. 1. c. 17,
& 21.

Lib. 2. c. 2.
Origin. Britan.
c. 5. p. 357.

Bed. l. 1. c. 25.

Vindicat. of
the Answer of
some late Pa-
pers. p. 72, &c.

3. That the Doctrine which *Augustin* taught, being the Doctrine of *Gregory* the Great, is vastly different from what has been since taught in the Church of *Rome*.

4. That *Augustin*'s proud carriage towards the *British* Bishops, and the death of 1200 Monks of *Bangor*, occasioned by their denial of Subjection unto him, do sufficiently shew of what Temper he was, and that he thought it lawful to make use of other means besides the Efficacy of his Doctrine, to promote what he was sent hither by the Pope about.

Bed. l. 2. c. 2.

Galsfridus
Monumet.
Hist. Brit. l. 11.
c. 12. & 13.

The next Mission which the Cardinal makes mention of, is that of *Kilianus* by Pope *Conon*, who converted the People of *Franconia*, whose chief City was *Herbipolis*,

polis, or *Wirtzburg*. Now the account that the *Centuriators* give of this *Kilianus*, and which makes him not to have had that success in the Conversion of People as is pretended, is this, *viz.* That being a Monk, and by Nation a Scottish-man, and not being able to do any good amongst his own Country-men with his preaching up of new Rites and Ceremonies, he passed over into *Germany* to see what he could do there; and finding that at *Wirtzburg* the Governour *Gosbertus* gave him but little Encouragement, he being one who, as those Historians relate, did *abhor those Popish Ceremonies* which *Kilianus* taught, he went to *Rome*, and got the Pope to make him Bishop of that City, hoping that at his return thither with greater Authority, he should be better received; but was soon slain by his own Auditors.

Centur. Mag-
deb. Cent. 7.
p. 516.

The third Instance is, the Conversion of a great part of *Germany* by *Vinofrid*, otherwise called *Boniface*, who seem'd a little to mistrust the Efficacy of his Doctrine, when he thus wrote; *That without the Command and Awe of the Prince of the Francks, he could not be able to hinder the Pagan Rites and Idol-Sacrileges in Germany*: and, as the *Centuriators* tell us, entred the Country of the *Thuringi* with an Army, forcing them to take Refuge in a fortified place; and when upon no other terms they were willing to turn Christians, but upon their being freed from paying Tenths for the future to the King of *Hungary*, gratified them therein.

Bonif. Ep. 3.

Cent. 8. p. 21,
22.

Of the Conversion of the *Vandals* which he ascribes to the Monks of *Corbie*, hear the account that *Albertus Krantzius* gives. *The Vandals*, says he, *were a Nation*
singu-

- Lib. 1. c. 1. *singularly given to the Superstitious Worship of their Idols, till by the Arms of the King of Denmark by Sea, by those of the Pomeranian on the East, and those of other Christian Princes on the South, they were forced to become Christian.*
- Saxo Gram. As to the Conversion of the *Danes*, we are told, that
 Hist. Dan. l. 9. *Harald* being beaten by *Regner*, and having no other
 p. 158. hopes, fled for help to *Ludovicus* the Emperour, then at
 Alb. Krantzii *Mentz*, who refused to assist him upon any other condi-
 Metrop. l. 1. tion, than that of his turning Christian, which he and
 c. 19. his People accordingly did. And as for the *Bulgarians*,
Sclavonians, &c. besides that they were converted by
 their Neighbour *Greeks*, as well as *Italians*, especially
 the *Bulgarians* (whose disturbance from some Western
 Ep. 2. Missionaries *Photius* passionately laments) it is not a
 sign that they were made so subject to the Popes of
Rome, as is pretended; since, as the *Centuriators* tell
 us, when Pope *Nicholas* would have obliged the *Scla-*
 Cent. 9. c. 2. *vonians* and *Polonians*, whom *Cyrillus* and *Methodius*,
 col. 18. who converted them, had taught to have their publick
 Service in their own Tongue, to have it in Latin, they
 stoutly resisted him. So that the Pope, that he might
 keep up his usurped Authority, was forced to pretend
 that he gave them leave to have it in their own Lan-
 guage.

But amongst all his Instances, the Cardinal had least reason to have mention'd the Conversion of the *Indians* and *Jews*. For as for the *Indians*, the unheard-of Cruelties which even the Popish Historians relate to have been used towards them, and their gross Ignorance after their Conversion, are a sufficient Evidence, how little they were beholden for it to the Doctrine which was taught them. One would wonder how it were possible for Mankind to be guilty of such inhu-
 man

man Barbarities as *Bartolomeus Casas*, who was a Bishop and lived in *India*, relates the *Spaniards* to have committed. In abhorrence whereof *Acosta* has a Discourse on purpose to shew the Unreasonableness of making War against the *Barbarians*, upon the account of Religion. He afterwards discourses of the Capacity of the *Indians*, asserting that they ought to have better Instructors sent them. That those which they then had, had been of such little use to them, that after the space of forty Years, there were scarce any found amongst so great a number of Converts, who understood two Articles of the Creed, or had any apprehension what Christ, Eternal Life, or the Eucharist meant. But this concerning the Conversion of the *Indians*, has already been mentioned in Note the fourth.

L. 2. c. 2, &c.
De Ind. salut.
procur.

As for the manner of converting the *Jews*, I shall only make mention of one Instance, which happened in the time of *Heraclius* the Emperour, who writ to *Dagobert the King of France*, that he would command all the *Jews in his Dominions*, to turn *Christians*, and either to banish or slay those who would not; who accordingly did so, banishing as many as would not be baptized. Since *Erasmus*, who knew these matters well enough, has so freely declared, that altho their Conversion be a thing much to be wished for; yet that such Courses were taken by some to effect it, that of a wicked Jew, it often happened there was made a Christian much more wicked than he was before his Conversion.

L. 4. c. 3.
P. 358.

Aimoin. iv. 22.

Erasm. Annos
in Mar. 23.

Having thus shewn the weakness of the Cardinal's Arguments, all that I shall add upon this Subject shall be only this, That the mean Account some of our new Converts have

have given of Themselves, and the Motives of their Change looks not very favourable upon this Ninth Note, and makes it suspicious, that the Efficacy of Doctrine was not the only thing that did the work. But that on the other hand, since the chiefest Patrons of the Romish Cause do at this time endeavour to disguise their Religion with so much Artifice, and to represent it as like ours as they can; they do really think their Doctrine by its own Worth and Excellency, then most likely to prevail, when it is made appear to be most akin to that of the Reformed Churches.

T H E E N D.

E R R A T A.

PAge 212. line 26. read *sets it in*.
 Page 223. line 22. r. *the Church*.

L O N D O N,

Printed by *J. D.* for *Richard Chiswel* at the Rose and Crown in
 St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1687.

The Tenth Note of the CHURCH EXAMINED,

VIZ, HOLINESS of LIFE. &c.

*Decima Nota est Sanctitas Vitæ Auctorum, sive primorum Patrum
nostre Religionis. Bellarm. L. iv. c. 13. de Notis Ecclesiæ.*

I M P R I M A T U R.

June 22. 1687.

Jo. Battely.

IN this Argument it may suffice, if it be shown,

- I. What the Notion of *Holiness* is.
- II. That *Holiness* is not properly a *Note* of the true *Church*.
- III. That if it were a *Note* of the true *Church*, yet it would not so belong to the *Roman*, as to distinguish it from all other *Churches*; and to appear upon it as the Infallible Character of the only Fold of Christ.

I. For *Holiness*, it is of two kinds; Holiness of *Calling* and *Dedication*; of *Mind* and *Manners*.

By *Holiness* of *Calling* and *Dedication*, I mean the *Separation* of Persons from the unbelieving and wicked World; and the *incorporating* of them, by *Baptism*, into the Spiritual Society of the Christian Church: And, by such means, the *dedicating* of them to the Service of Christ, according to the tenour of the *Evangelical Covenant*.

In this Sense St. Paul told the Members of the Church of *Corinth* (a), that they were *wash'd* and *sanctify'd*; or, by their Christian Calling or Dedication, made Sacred and Holy.

By *Holiness* of *Mind* and *Manners*, to which Bellarmin here gives the Name of *Probity* (a Vertue commended by him, but coldly obey'd) I understand the habitual, private and publick Practice of Christian Religion, as it proceeds from the true *Principle* of it, the *Love of God*; as it is measur'd by the True *Rule* of it, Right Reason in Conjunction with the Revealed Will of God: And as it is directed to its proper *Ends*, the Glory of God, and the Good of all reasonable Creatures. For this kind of *Holiness*, St. Paul (b) makes pious Application to God in behalf of the *Thessalonians*, saying, *The very God of Peace sanctify you wholly: and I pray God your whole Spirit, and Soul, and Body be preserved blameless to the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.* Now,

II. Neither of these kinds of *Holiness* can be properly called a *Note* of the true Church.

For the *first Kind*; It is confess'd that the Christian Church is *Holy*, and it was called *Holy* in the Creed, before the Epithet of *Catholick* was inserted into that *Sum of Faith* (c). And the Supream Pastor of the

(c) S. Cypr. Epist. 70. p. 100. — cum dicimus [h. e. Baptizandis] credis in vitam æternam, & remissionem Peccatorum per Sanctam Ecclesiam?

Church lov'd it in such extraordinary manner, that (d) *He gave himself for it : that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of Water, by the Word, [by Baptism, and Assent to the Doctrine and Conditions of the Gospel] That he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing : [any thing which may seem uncomely to Christ, to whom she as Supream Head is united] That it should be Holy, and without blemish.* (d) Ephes. 5. 25, 26, 27.

This Holiness of Dedication is elegantly set forth (after the manner of the Oriental Poetry) in the Book of the *Canticles*, in which is represented the Spiritual Marriage of Christ, and his chaste and unblemish'd Church. Though some Romanists have wrested these and other places, which speak of her Dove-like and undefiled Nature, and apply them to that which they please to call the *Immaculate Conception* of the Blessed Virgin (e). So ready are they who upbraid the Reformed with Interpreting Scripture out of their own Heads, to do the same thing themselves, and with a much greater mixture of Extravagance.

(e) V. Coton
preuves par
l'Ecriture du
contenu en la
foy Catholi-
que. p. 1.

That the Church is Holy we daily profess. Nevertheless *such Holiness* of the Church cannot properly be called a *Note* of it, for it appertains to its Essence and Constitution, and shews what a Church is, and belongs to every Church, whether *Greek, Abyssine, Roman, or English*; and is not (according to *Bellarmin's* Sense of a *Note*) an *External Mark* by which we may distinguish betwixt Churches, and upon grounds of good Assurance, discern any true one from such as are false.

For the *Second kind* of *Holiness*, that of *Mind* and *Manners*; neither is *That*, so far as Man can take Cognizance of it, a certain Sign by which we may find out the *true* Christian Society. For,

First, The Officers of the Christian Church invite Men of all Nations and Conditions to come into the Bosom of it, and admit them upon their Profession of the common Christianity, not being able to penetrate into the Secrets of their Hearts, or to foresee whether they who are now in good earnest, will persevere or fall away. They may, therefore, admit into the true Fold such as are Wolves in Sheeps-cloathing. For *Novatian* himself did not deny that Men could be secretly wicked before and at Baptism, tho he was so rigid as not to believe the Sins committed after it to be forgiven. Hence our Saviour compar'd his Church to a *Net* which contained in it *good* and *bad Fishes*. And the bad may either soon appear, or be long conceal'd under the close Vail of Hypocrisy. So deceitful a mark of Incorruption in the Monument is the superficial Whiteness and Ornament of it. *Bellarmin* himself does here furnish us, from *Theodoret*, with the Instance of *Nestorius*, who by the help of a pale Look, set Speech and grave Apparel, deceived both the People and the Officers of the Church; and, by such Arts, lifted himself into an Episcopal Chair. "Now, he is not a Christian who is meerly
 "one outwardly; neither is that compleat Baptism
 "which is outward only in the Flesh: But he is a Christian who is, also, one inwardly; And Baptism is
 "that which is, likewise, inward in the Spirit, whose
 "praise is not only of Men, but of God.

Besides, where there is no such gross Hypocrisy, there may be a specious shew of Holiness, not uniform and entire yet proceeding from devout temper, some Seeds of natural Reason, and some few Principles of Christian Religion, whilst the rest are not embrac'd. Thus it was with the Sect of *Priscillian*, who by some kinds of real Strictnesses, upbraided the looseness of that Age.

Yet

Yet the *Catholick Christians* did not, from the regularity of their Lives, infer the soundness of their Party.

Likewise there are some Practices which both the Persons and the Spectators judg to be Holy, which are not so. Such a Practice was that of *Ignatius Loyola* (f), who gave an Alms readily to a poor Man, and to all the rest, who upon that poor Mans Report, press'd immediately upon him, till he had emptied all his Stock, and was forc'd, that Night, to beg Bread for himself. This Charity, how indiscreet soever it was, mov'd the poor to cry out with much Admiration (as Storyeth *Masseius*) *A Saint, a Saint*.

(f) *Masseius*
in vitâ Ignar.
l. 1. p. 74, 75.

Seeing, then, the weak will mistake the very Nature of Holiness, and the most judicious can only see the external part of it, it is not safe arguing for the goodness of the Cause from the seeming goodness of the Life. It is true, we ought to use a *Judgment of Charity*: But, in a Case, where we are proving our Faith, it becomes us to proceed upon more unquestionable Grounds.

Secondly, Under the same Constitution, People may live sometimes with more and sometimes with less Morality: If, therefore, we should prove the State or Church by the manners of the Members, the same Constitution at different Times, would be good and bad, and vary as Men do. *Bellarmin* speaks of the Holiness of Doctrine, and the Efficacy of it; but it is not irresistibly efficacious: And often we find worse Men under better Means, and better Men under worse. Thus it falls out in Civil Societies, where the Model remaining or being improv'd, the Vertues of the Subjects decline. It did so towards the latter end of the Roman Empire, in which, tho the Laws remain'd, the Dregs of *Romulus* began to rise again. Thus it was in the Church of *Israel* which was always, as God had fram'd it,

it, a true Church. But if Holiness of Life had been made a *Note* of it, it might, in some Junctures, have been called a Church, but oftner no Church at all: Before their Captivity, there was a general Corruption of Manners; and their Reformation, upon their Deliverance, was imperfect: And the Sense of God's Goodness to them began to wear off; and tho they did forbear to adulterate the worship of the true God with mixtures of Idolatry; yet they admitted of the formal Religion of the *Pharisees* which made void real and solid Piety. Insomuch that when our Saviour visited the World he could scarce find any *Probity* in it.

There are many ways, by which Men, under the same Constitution, may lead more or less virtuous Lives. Such are, *The good or bad Examples of Great Men*; *strict or loose Discipline*; *Affliction or overgrowth in Wealth and Power*; *War or Peace*. And the last of these is too often, tho not the just Cause, yet the occasion of Secularity, and of the growing of a kind of slothful Rust upon those who are at ease. St. Cyprian (g) speaking of the little quiet the *African Church* had for a few Years (from *Severus* to *Decius*) tho not without some trouble from the Heathens; complains of the Corruption which it bred among Christians.

Thirdly, Add to this, that unless a Man do first understand the Nature and *Doctrine* of the Christian Church, he cannot know what *Sanctity* is, and what that is in the Life of any Man, which he is to take for the Holiness of a Christian. So that the way to be well assured about a true Church, is to take our measures, not from the Lives of the Members, but from the *Doctrines* of their Society. And one might imagine that

(g) Card. Perr. Cardinal *Perron* himself (h) in this Argument had more regard to the *Doctrine* than the *Life*, when he alluded to

(g) S. Cyp. Ser. de Lapsill. p. 123. Ox.
----Pax longa
corruperat ja-
centem fidem
& pœnè dix-
ram dormi-
tantem, &c.

(h) Card. Perr.
Reply to King
James. l. 4. c. 6.

to an Expression in the *Canticles*, in this fanciful manner. "The *Church* sings, and will always sing, I am *black*, but I am *fair*: that is to say, I am *black* in *Manners*, but *fair* in *Doctrine*. Which blackness of Manners if he intended as a spot of Beauty upon his fair Doctrine, he did not see with Christian Eyes. But,

III. Admitting that Holiness of Life were a *Note* of the true Church, the *Roman* Church would not, from this Concession, derive any great advantage. It is true, and it is granted,

First, That at the beginning, the Christians at *Rome* were famous both for their Faith and Manners. And no Man, that I know of, asperseth *Linus*, the first Bishop there, who (as *Platina* saith) had a mighty Reputation for *Sanctity*, and dy'd a glorious *Martyr* under *Saturninus* the *Consul*. But the like may be alledged in favour of the Mother Church of *Hierusalem*, and of *St. James* the Bishop of it. In the mean while, it may be noted that, in *Rome*, it being the Imperial City, there was a very early affectation of such *Superiority* as Christ forbad in his Kingdom: And *St. Hierom* at the same time (i) that he takes notice of the right Faith of *Rome* (for then it was contain'd within the limits of the Apostles Creed) he reproves that Ambition which had seated it self in Purple on the Seven Hills. And this Leaven had before that time swell'd the Contentious Popes, *Victor* and *Stephen*.

(i) S. Hieron.
Epist. ad Mar-
cellan. p. 127.

Secondly, It must be further acknowledged, that in the later Ages, there have been Men of that Communion devoutly inclin'd, and of good Morals. But this Effect has not had *Popery* for its Cause, but has been derived from Principles common to all Christians. And it is from the influence of the first twelve Articles, and not

not of the Additional ones of *Trent*, that such Men have been so pious and so free from blemish. In this number are usually put *Thaulerus* and *Savanarola*. And it appears by their Words, that mere Romanism was not the Spring from which their Devotions flow'd.

(*k*) Thauler. "There (*k*) be many (saith *Thaulerus*) who go under the
in Fest. de uno " Name of Religious, who take great pains in Set-Fasts,
aliquo Confess. " Vigils, Orizons, and frequent Confessions: For they
Luc. 11. " believe they may be justify'd and sav'd merely by such
" external Works. For *Savanarola* his Spirit may be dis-
cerned by such Discourse as this (*l*). " I never was de-
" lighted with such Books as the Revelations of St. *Bri-*
(*l*) Compend. " *gid*, or Abbot *Joachim*. I never read the former; and
Revelat. Savan. " the latter very sparingly.— The reading of the Old
p. 272, 273. " and New Testament pleaseth me so much, that, for
" many Years I have used no other Book, disgusting (as
" I may say) other Writings. Not that I despise them,
" but that in comparison of the *Scriptures*, all such sweet
" things taste, to me, as bitter. Neither,

Thirdly, Have the *Reformed* so much of the *Pharisee* as to justify themselves, and say, that in all their *Field* there has not been a *Tare*. But the *Men* have been in fault, and not the *Cause*. God be merciful to us Sinners; greater Sinners than some others upon one account, inasmuch as we offend against clearer Light. Yet it may be here noted, that *Bellarmin* has put into his Catalogue of Sinners, *Simon Magus*, *Valentine*, *Marcion*, *Montanus*, and such others as do not at all belong to us; and that *He* and other Romanists mis-represent *Luther*, blackning of him with slanderous Art, and then exposing him as a perfect *Aethiopian*. He was, indeed, a Man of warm Temper, and uncourtly Language. But (besides that he had his Education among Those who so vehemently revild him) it may be consider'd, whether in passing through

through so very rough a Sea, it was not next to impossible for him not to beat the insulting Waves till they foam'd again.

He had his Infirmities, but *his* are taken notice of, whilst more Candour is shew'd to Men of great Name, and well nigh equal Heat. To omit the fierce Words which pass'd betwixt St. *Chrysostom* and *Epiphanius*, St. *Hierom* and *Ruffinus*; it is manifest that *Lucifer* Bishop of *Calaris* in *Sardinia* (who was much esteem'd by Pope *Liberius*, and who is called *Holy Lucifer*, according to the style of the time in which he lived) wrote Books against his own *Emperor Constantius*, which were one entire Invective. And when (for instance sake) he pleas'd to call him, *Most Impudent Emperor* (*m*), I suppose he had not a better Talent than *Luther* in the Address of Courts. There was, therefore, something else which sharpened the Tongues and Pens of many against *Luther*: *Erasmus* tells us, "That (*n*) he perceiv'd the better "any Man was, the more he relish'd "the Writings of *Luther*. That his very Enemies allow'd him to be a Man of good Life. That he seem'd "to him to have in his Breast certain eminent Evangelical Sparks. That 'twas plain that some condemn'd "those things in *Luther's* Writings, which, in St. *Austin's* and St. *Bernard's* Works, pass'd for Orthodox "and Pious.

The same *Erasmus* pointed to the true reasons of this usage of *Luther* (*o*.) He said he had *two Faults*: He touch'd the Monks Bellicies, and the Popes Crown.

There have been much worse Men than *Luther* in all Parties, and particularly in the *Roman Church*, which, if Inquisition were made for a Society by the Marks of

(*m*) Luc. Calar. Ad Constant. pro S. Athan. p. 25. l. 1. Responde Imperator Impudentissime. p. 39. Filius Pestilentia, &c. p. 102. Qui sis non solum mendax sed Homicida.

(*n*) Erasmi. Ep. ad Albert. Episc. & Princ. Mogunt. Cardin. p. 584, 585.

(*o*) Carion in Cron. Austr. a Peuc. i. 5.

Holy Life, would not, above all others, be taken hold of. And,

First, Thus much may appear from the *Complaints* of *Corruption* in the Latin Church, made, in so many places, by so many considerable Persons, and with such deep Resentment.

Many Books have been professedly written upon that Subject; such as those of *Clemangis*, of the *corrupt state of the Church*; of *Alvarez Pelagius* of the *Plaint of the Church*; of *Picus Mirandula*, concerning the *Reformation of the Church*, offer'd to the Fathers of the Council of *Lateran*; and of *Petrus de Aliaco* Cardinal of *Cambray*, presented by him in the Council of *Constance*. Others have, in particular places, tho not in an entire work, given vent to their Grievances upon the like occasion.

How black are the Characters which are given of the State of the Latin Church by *Baronius*

(p) Earon. Annal. ad Ann. 900.
p. 650. & ad Ann. 912. N. 8. p. 685.
N. 14. p. 689. Ed. Col.

(r) Bellarm. Chronol. Ad Ann.
1026. p. 93. & de Sacram. l. 1. c. 8.
de Gemit. Columbæ. p. 192, 208.
209, 392.

(r) Genebr. Chronol. Ad Ann.
901.

(p), by *Bellarmin* (q), by *Genebrard* (r). About the Year 900, and so forwards for more than an hundred Years. *Baronius* speaks of *Monsters* intruded into the *Holy See*, and by the help of *Monsters*. For such were *John* the Tenth, and *Theodora* who advanc'd him. *Bellarmin* represents the Popes of those Times as degenerating from the Piety

of their Predecessors, of which some had no very great share. And he says, that in the *West*, and almost all the World over, (and especially amongst those who were called the *Faithful*) Faith had failed; and that there was no fear of God among them. He mentions the Vision of *Pachomius* the Abbot, who (it seems) saw Monasteries increasing, and Piety decreasing. And he applys the Vision to his Age; and, upon that occasion, he

he useth the Words of the Prophet, *Thou hast multiply'd the Nation, but not increased their Joy.* Genebrard reports that for almost 150 Years, the Popes were rather *Apostatical* than *Apostolical*. So dismal a state of things might (if he had pleas'd) been reprov'd more solemnly than with a Chime of Words. St. Bernard ^(s) thus laments, and reproves the looseness of his Age. "Woe to ^(s) S. Bern. Scrm. 33, in Cant. p. 673. "this Generation, because of Hypocrisy; if that may be "call'd Hypocrisy, which for the abundance of it cannot, "and for its Impudence does not desire to be conceal'd. In the Ceremonial for the Election of Popes ^(t) there is ^(t) Cer. de Elect. Pont. p. 17. deep Complaint of such Corruption, as (in the Phrase of that Book) caused *the Pillars of the Church to shake*. In our own Kingdom, the Norman Invasion has been, in great measure, imputed to the decay of Learning and Piety in that Age ^(u), in which, "the Priests could scarce ^(u) G. Malou. in Wil. 1. l. 3. p. 102. "stammer out Mass: He was esteemed a Prodigy in "Learning who understood Grammar; the great Ones "frequented not the Church; all sorts of People were "given to shameful Intemperance. In sum, for many years together before the Council of Trent (which acted contrary to the design for which it was, by good Men, desir'd) no Voices were more frequent and more loud in the Roman Church than the *Cries for Reformation*. But,

Secondly, To pass by *general Complaints*, we may furnish our selves with abundance of Instances, in the Lives of particular Men of that Communion, who have been infamous for Impiety. And because Bellarmin is pleas'd to send us to the *Fathers* and *Doctors* of his Church for Examples of Holiness, we will thither go; observing three Things by the way. *First*, That he has put the *Patriarchs*, *Prophets* and *Apostles* into his Catalogue, tho they are more *Ours* than *His*. *Secondly*, That he has forborn the mention of any one *Pope*, lest he should have

put us upon inquiring after the rest. *Thirdly*, That He could not be ignorant of the History of the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* who were esteemed great Doctors & Reverend Fathers in the Jewish Church, and *sate in the Chair of Moses*, but *said* and *did not*; and dishonoured that true Church, but had upon them no *Note* of real Sanctity by which they might commend it.

My Business is not to write a History of the *Lives* of *Popes*, or of the *Founders* of *Monastick Orders*. I shall content myself with a few Reflections upon *two* or *three* of this sort of Men, with whom the more the World is acquainted, the less Veneration it will have for them.

I will not be partial, but begin with an eminent Man, *Pope Gregory* the Great, who is said to be the *last* of the *good Popes*, and the *first* of the *bad*. This Man took upon him to give *Austin* the Monk Authority over the *British Bishops*, who were Strangers to him, and never under the Yoke either of him or his Predecessors. He fawn'd upon the Emperor *Mauritius* whilst he liv'd and prosper'd; and own'd him as his Patron and the maker of his Fortunes (w), even before he had made his own. But, as soon as the Emperor and his Family were barbarously murdered by the most bloody Vassal and Usurper *Phocas*; *Gregory* insulted over this dead Lyon, and flatter'd this living Monster (x), and his most immoral Wife *Leontia* (y). He used such Words at his *usurp'd Exaltation*, as he did at that which he call'd the *Conversion* of *England* (z); singing, profanely, *Glory to God in the Highest*—Let the *Heavens rejoice* and the *Earth be glad*. He exercised, also, his Talent of unchristian Flattery towards *Brunichild* Queen of *France* (a), who was stained in the Blood of ten Crown'd *Heads*; and against whom *Lucilius*, if alive, could not write a Satyr. If

(w) S. Greg. l. 1. Ep. 1. fol. 356. Par. 1523. l. 2. Ep. 61. fol. 373. Ex illo jam tempore dominus meus fuisti, quando adhuc dominus non eras.
(x) Ep. 43. l. 11. fol. 441. Quantas Omnip. Dom. laudes debemus quod remoto jugo Tristitia, ad Libertatis tempora, sub Imperiali benignitatis vestra Pietate, pervenimus, &c.
(y) Ep. 44. l. 11. fol. 441. Quæ lingua, &c.
(z) Ep. 58. l. 9. fol. 431. ad Aug. Episc.

Angl. de Convers. Gentis. Gloria in excelsis, &c. Lib. 11. p. 441. Ep. 36. Greg. Phocæ Augusto. Gloria in excelsis Deo qui, juxta quod Scriptum est, mutat tempora & transfert Regna, &c. Latentur cœli & exultet Terra. (a) L. 5. Ep. 59. f. 392. Greg. Brun. Excellentia vestra Christianitas, &c.

If now, even in the Life of *St. Gregory the Great*, we want the *Note* of sufficient *Probity*; at what a loss must we be in the Life of such an one as *Pope John 12th*, who, in a Synod held at *Rome* ^(b), was formally accused before *Otto the Great* of these horrible Crimes: viz. ^{(b) Luitprand. Hist. l. 6. c. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. P. 153, to 152.}

‘The ordaining a Deacon in a Stable; the committing of Adultery and Incest; the putting out the Eyes of a holy Man; the drinking a Health to the God of this World; the invoking of *Jupiter* and *Venus* when he was at Dice, in favour of his Cast. The Synod sate, the Witnesses were ready, his Presence was urged by the Emperor and the Synod. He refused to appear; and instead of purging himself, he sent this Menace to the Synod; That if the Fathers deposed him, he would excommunicate all of them, and make them incapable of ordaining and of celebrating Mass.

This is testified by *Luitprandus*, upon whose Word *Bellarmino* concludes the *Sanctity* of *Pope Formosus* ^(c); ^{(c) Bell. Cron. Ann. 891. p. 83.} and therefore against him at least, he is Author sufficient for the Wickedness of *Pope John*.

This surpriseth not those observing Men who look into the Inside of the Consistory, and see those evil Arts by which Elections are often made; Arts, some of which the *Ceremonial* it self does not dissemble ^(d). ^{(d) Cer. de Elect. Pont. p. 17. deniq; per quot simonia-}

ca Hæresis Trapezitas, repetitis malleis, cebrisq; Invasionibus subjacuit. Vide in p. 37. Eull. Julii 2. contra simoniacè electos, & simoniacè cligentes.

Touching the *Sanctity* of Founders of Orders, *St. Dominick* is one of *Bellarmino*’s great Examples. But he must excuse the Reformed World, if it will not take a blot for an admirable Figure.

Pope Innocent dream’t that *Dominick* was chosen as a Prop to the *Lateran* Building, which, without the aid his Shoulders gave it, would have fallen to the Ground.

Ground. As if his *Holiness* had not been Pillar enough for the supporting of it; for perhaps he was as omnipotent as he was infallible. Yet, after all this, he was a Trumpeter in that holy War against the innocent *Albigenses*, in which *both Swords* were used to the Ruine of so many Families, and the Loss of so many Lives in a very barbarous manner. The Consciences of those People having mov'd them to bear testimony against the Corruptions of *Rome* (e).

(e) V. Thuan. Hist. l. 6.
ad An. 1550.
p. 186, 187.
Æmil. l. 6. de
Reb. Gest.
Franc.

For some other Orders, every Eye cannot see that contempt of the World which is so much talked of, and so seldom found. The readiest way, in the Ecclesiastical State, to grow considerable in the World, is first to enter into some of the Orders. And for Example sake, it was some while ago the boast of some Men, that there had been of St. *Benedict's* Order (f) 24 Popes, 183 Cardinals, and 1570 Abbots.

(f) Valateria-
ni Anthropol.
21. p. 753.

The Austerities and Mortifications of such Orders are generally mention'd as Proofs of their extraordinary Holiness. Yet you will find even among the Heathens as great Rigours, as amongst the severest in *their* Cloysters. The *Jesuits*, in their late *Voyage to Siam*, have furnish'd us with an Instance, in the *Talopins* of that Country, who in such strictnesses, seem not inferior to S. *Bruno* himself. 'They have an Estate of Life, not much unlike to his, call'd *Vipassana* (g), in which they keep perpetual silence, and give themselves up to the Contemplation of Holy Things. The *Jesuits* assure us that 'they reproach'd the *Romans* for want of sufficient veneration of Sacred Images, Holy Writings, and Priests (h). 'They tell us that for that which concerns their Manners and Conduct of Life, a Christian can teach nothing more perfect than that which *their* Religion prescribes. 'That it forbids the Impiety of every Thought. 'That

Voyage de Si-
am. l. 6. p. 412.
on ne peut rien
voir de plus
austere, &c.

(h) Ib. p. 410.

' what

' what are Counsels among Christians, are, with *Talopins*, indispenfable Precepts. That they forbid the use
 ' of any Liquor which may intoxicate. That they drink
 ' no Wine upon any occasion. That they are extremely
 ' scandaliz'd at Christian Priests for drinking it. That
 ' they are charitable to Beasts, and relieve them in their
 ' needs (*i*). That they take great pains in preaching and
 ' educating Youth, in their *Monasteries*, shaving them, ^{(i) P. 414, 415, 416.}
 ' putting them on a Habit, causing them to fast, forbid-
 ' ding them to sing or play, or hear Singers, or see pub-
 ' lick Spectacles, or use Perfumes, or love or touch
 ' Money, or delight in what they eat, but to mix some-
 ' thing unpleasant with it (*k*). They report, further, ^{(k) P. 418.}
 ' concerning the *Talopins* themselves, that they observe
 ' many Rules of Strictness, besides those by which their
 ' Scholars and the Laity are obliged. That they frequent
 ' their Pagods; look not on Women, speak not to them;
 ' live on Alms, but go not into the Houses; expose
 ' themselves to the open Heavens several Nights in *Fe-*
 ' *bruary* in the midst of the Fields; keep a solemn Fast
 ' of three Months, preach every day of that season; re-
 ' cite a kind of *Chapelet*: preach sometimes from mor-
 ' ning to night (each in his turn for six hours together)
 ' without wearying the Hearers (*l*). They cast a Ring ^{(l) Ib. p. 418, 419, 420, 422.}
 ' into the Sea, and it is calm (if we have Faith to be-
 ' lieve it.) They have places to which great Numbers
 ' of *Pilgrims* travel upon the score of Devotion. They
 ' have Images which they carry abroad for the procuring
 ' of good Weather. They have (they say) a Relick
 ' of their God *Sommonokhodom* who is ascended, a porti-
 ' on of his Hair (*m*). So that if *mere monastick Sancti-* ^{(m) Ib. p. 413, 415, 410.}
 ' ty be a Note of a true Religious Society, you may find
 ' out by it such a Society at *Siam*.

Last of all, There are many Things in the Roman Church it self, which, by helping forward an ill Life, do, in part, deface this *Mark* of her Sanctity. Such as charming Consecrations, Indulgences, Dispensations, and other abuses of the Seal of the Church; Doctrines about Masses, Attrition, Purgatory, and *Papal Supremacy*. Which last is very prejudicial to the Quiet of the World, especially in the *Deposing Point*, concerning which, I take leave to use the Words of another,

(r) *Postscript to*
Transl. of
Maimb. Hist. of
the League. p.
15, 16, 17.

‘He was (n) himself a Preacher for the *League* in *Paris*, during the Rebellion there of *K. Henry* the 4th. Some of his Principles are these following. *In the Kingdoms of Men*, ‘*the Power of the King is from the People, because the People make the King*. Observing that he says [*in the Kingdoms of Men*] there is no doubt but he restrains this Principle to the Subordination of the Pope. ‘*For his Holiness* in that Rebellion, as you have heard, was declared ‘*Protector of the League*. So that the *Pope* first *excommunicates* ‘(which is the *Outlawry* of the Church); and, by virtue of this *Excommunication*, the People are left to their own natural Liberty, and ‘may, without further Process from *Rome*, depose him. Accordingly ‘you see it practis’d in the same Instance. *Pope Sixtus* first thunder- ‘struck King *Henry* the 3^d and the *King of Navarr*. Then the *Sorbon* ‘make Decrees that they have successively forfeited the Crown: The ‘Parliament verifies these Decrees; and the *Pope* is petition’d to confirm the Sense of the Nation, that is, of the Rebels. But, I have ‘related this too favourably for *Bellarmin*. For we hear him, in another place, positively affirming it as *Matter of Faith*, *If any Christian* ‘*Prince shall depart from the Catholick Religion, and shall withdraw* ‘*others from it; He immediately forfeits all Power and Dignity, even* ‘*before the Pope has pronounc’d Sentence on him: And his Subjects, in* ‘*case they have Power to do it, may, and ought to cast out such an Heretick*, from his Sovereignty over Christians.

If, therefore, the *Faith* of *Bellarmin* be *Faction*, whatsoever his Church is in it self, it is certain, as he has made it, it can never be found out, either as *The Church*, or as *A* found Church, so far as we are to look for it by the *Note of Holiness*.

T H E E N D.

L O N D O N,

Printed by J. D. for Richard Chiswell at the Rose and Crown in
St. Paul’s Church-Yard, 1687.

The Eleventh Note of the CHURCH
 EXAMINED,
 VIZ
The GLORY of MIRACLES.

Undecima Nota est Gloria Miraculorum. Bellarm. de Notis Ecclesiæ. L. iv. c. 14.

I M P R I M A T U R.

June 28. 1687.

Guil. Needham.

HAD not the *Cardinal* either thought by the meer number of his *Notes*, to have given the greater show to the *Argument*; or wrote in pure Compliance to the Humour and Interests of the Age wherein he liv'd, he would hardly have insisted upon *this* of *Miracles*, especially in the method wherein he hath manag'd it. For by instancing from the very *First* Age of the Church, to the *Fifteenth*, nay to the *Sixteenth* (wherein Himself undertook the defence of it) he hath interest'd himself, in all the ridiculous Stories, the Phantastick Legends, which the Monkish, Fabulous Ages have deliver'd, the meer recital of which (since he hath espous'd them) might be a sufficient Exposure of *his* Argument. And indeed, had the Cardinal's

Authors but us'd the same grave Care and Fidelity, which that great Historian (tho a *Gentile*) profess in his writing the *Peloponnesian War*, he had lost the greatest part of this *Note*, and we been excus'd the pains of exa-

mining it. For that Historian tells us, "He could mul-
 tiply Fables as others have done, and they might per-
 haps be more divertive to an injudicious Reader, but
 his regard should be to what is true and certain, which
 all that have a mind to the certainty of things should
 judg much more profitable.

Thucyd. l. i. p. 16. A. B. C. "Καὶ ἐς μὲν ἀ-
 κέραιον ἴσως
 τὸ μὴ μυθεῖσθαι
 ἃ τερπνέουσιν
 φαίνεται. ὅσοι
 δὲ βελήσονται
 τῶν τε γινόμε-
 νων τὸ σαφές σκοπεῖν καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ποτε εἶναι. κατὰ τὸ ἀντιρρόπων, τοιούτων καὶ παρόπλων
 ἔσονται, ὡφελίμια κελίειν αὐτὰ ἀρκούντως ἔξει.

However, proceed we to the Examination of this *Note*, as the Cardinal hath thought fit to propose it in proof of *His Church*.

"As to this, he premiseth this twofold Foundation.

"(1.) *That Miracles are necessary to evince any new Faith, or extraordinary Mission.*

"(2.) *That Miracles are efficacious and sufficient.* By the former (he tells us) may be deduc'd that the *Church* is not to be found amongst us *Protestants*: By the latter, that it is most assuredly amongst them.

"1. As to the *Necessity of Miracles* he quotes *Moses* (a),
 (a) Exod. iv.
 (b) Matth. x. "St. *Matthew* (b), and St. *John* (c). He further proves
 (c) Joh. xv. "it by a Similitude of one necessarily shewing his Or-
 ders received from his *Dioceſan*, by which he is autho-
 riz'd to Preach; and by a Quotation from St. *Austin*,
 "and the Concession of *Melancthon* one of the Reform'd
 "Persuasion; all which was needless, and the Similitude
 "too weak and inconclusive.

"2. As to the *Efficacy and Sufficiency of Miracles*; He
 "proves this, partly as they are the Seals and Testimo-
 "nials God useth, without whose immediate Power they
 "could

“ could not be perform’d, and who will by no means
 “ bear witness to a Lye. And therefore, where either
 “ *Turks, or Pagans, Jews, Hereticks, or false Prophets,*
 “ have pretended to any extraordinary Feats or Accom-
 “ plishments of this kind, either they have appear’d the
 “ meer Tricks and Delusions of the Devil; or else, in
 “ the Attempts they have made, they have been pub-
 “ lickly disgrac’d and disappointed: So the Prophets of
 “ *Baal, Simon Magus,* several of the *Donatists, Luther*
 “ and *Calvin.* In the Application of the whole, for the
 “ proof of *His Church,* and the utter exclusion of *Ours*
 “ from all Title to the Denomination and Benefits of a
 “ Church, he gives a summary of Miracles in every di-
 “ stinct Age, by which the Church of *Rome* and no o-
 “ ther (for that is the whole drift of his Argument)
 “ hath been all along signaliz’d as the *True Catholick*
 “ Church. In the first Age, he mentions the Miracles
 “ of the Holy Jesus, and his Apostles. In the second,
 “ those of the Christian Souldiers under *Antonius* the
 “ Emperor. In the third, those of *Gregory Thaumatur-*
 “ *gus.* In the fourth, those of *Anthony, Hilarion* and
 “ others. In the fifth, several mention’d by *St. Austin*
 “ as done in his time. In the sixth, some Wonders
 “ done by Popes, viz. *John* and *Agapetus.* In the se-
 “ venth, Miracles wrought in *England* by *Austin* the
 “ Monk, and his Company. In the eighth, *St. Cuth-*
 “ *bert,* and *St. John* in *England.* In the ninth, those of
 “ *Tharasius,* and great Numbers by *Sebastian* the Mar-
 “ tyr. In the tenth, *St. Rombold, St. Dunstan,* and a
 “ certain King of *Poland* with others. In the eleventh,
 “ *St. Edward, St. Anselm,* and (to make up the number)
 “ honest *Hildebrand,* or Pope *Gregory VII.* In the
 “ twelfth, *St. Malachy* and *St. Bernard.* In the thirteenth,
 “ *St. Francis* and *Bonaventure, St. Dominic* and others.

“ In the fourteenth, St. *Bernardinus* and *Catharine* of
 “ *Senna*. In the fifteenth, *Vincentius*, St. *Anthonine* and
 “ others. And lastly, in the Cardinal’s own Age,
 “ *Franciscus de Paula*, and the Holy *Xaviere* among the
 “ *Indians*.

Thus having laid down the main Scheme of the Cardinal’s managing this *Note*, which he calls the *Glory of Miracles*, I shall shew the weakness of this proof, as it concerns the Church of *Rome* distinct, and exclusively to that of the *Reformed*. And that under these three Heads.

I. That *meer* Miracles, without any other Considerations at all, are not a sufficient *Note* of any Church or Religion whatever.

II. Much less are those Miracles which are alledged in the Church of *Rome*, any tolerable Proof or Confirmation of these particular Doctrines or Practices, wherein we of the Reform’d Church do differ from them.

III. And Lastly ; We of the Reform’d Church, as we do not pretend to the working of Miracles in our Age, so if we did, we could pretend to prove nothing by them but what hath been already sufficiently prov’d by the Miracles of Christ and his Apostles.

I. That *meer* Miracles, without any other Considerations at all, are not a sufficient *Note* of any Church or Religion whatever. I add this Passage [*without any other Considerations at all*] because those Miracles which are
 recorded

recorded and embrac'd by all the Faithful, as part of the undeniable proof of Christianity, are attended with all the Circumstances that are requisite to strengthen and enforce them : Whereas, those Miracles which the Church of *Rome* pretends to, in Confirmation of some Doctrines, which we differ from them in, they are attended with none of the requisite Considerations to enforce them, *i. e.* they are produc'd meerly to confirm some particular Doctrines, which Doctrines have no antecedent advantage of being plainly and expressly laid down in the Holy Scriptures, nor the Miracles themselves of being foretold by any Prophecy.

As for those Miracles that in Primitive Days were wrought to confirm Christianity in general. It was the infinite goodness of Providence to make them of that nature, and to order the performance of them in that way, that there is no room left for the *honest, considering* mind to reject them : Either as to matter of Fact to mistrust that they were never done ; or as to their Force and Efficacy, to suspect that they do not most fully confirm what they were produc'd for.

1. As to matter of Fact ; they were done so publicly, and in the view of those that were the greatest Enemies ; and after they were done, they were reported partly so soon, in an Age when there were so many then alive that could have contradicted the Report if not well grounded ; and partly with so much hazard, that as the very reporting them expos'd them to the rage of the Enemy to the uttermost : so the Falshood of them, if it had appear'd, had brought upon them the scorn of those that had been kindest inclin'd. Whereas, the Miracles that are more peculiarly appropriated to the Church of *Rome*, they are never pretended to be done but amongst those of their own Communion, never for the

Con-

* Vid. Pref. to
the School of the
Eucharist.

Conviction of any one Gainſayer, no one of the Re-form'd Religion having ever once been an Eye-witneſs to any of them *. They come handed to us from a dark and fabulous Age, reported of Perſons, who themſelves hint no ſuch thing of themſelves in any of their own Writings, but rather to the contrary, as may be ſeen more afterward: And the Stories they have fram'd, gave them no hazard (excepting loſs of Reputation with all wiſe Men) for it was in a time when the Monk's Plenty, and Eaſe, and Freedom from all Dangers, gave them a Luxurancy of Thought and Fancy, and the Invention it ſelf a Title to the Favour of great Men, and perhaps to the ſame kind of Honour to be done for them after Death. So St. *Bernard* had the Fame of Miracles affixt to him by thoſe that came after him: as he had done to St. *Malachy* in the ſame Age with himſelf. So alſo St. *Anthony* tells his Stories of St. *Vincentius*, and *Surius* his of him. But then,

2. Beſides matter of Fact wherein as to the certainty of the thing and the reaſons of Credibility there is ſo great a difference, ſo alſo is there, in the Force and Efficacy of the one and of the other, to confirm what they are produc'd for. There is a moſt unqueſtionable force in the Argument taken from thoſe Miracles that were for the firſt proof of Chriſtianity, but not ſo in the other, as we ſhall ſee anon. There are theſe Circumſtances that highly recommend the Primitive Miracles.

1. That thoſe that were wrought were generally very beneficial to Human Nature, doing mighty offices of Kindneſs toward thoſe whom they were wrought upon: Such as, *healing the Sick, raiſing the Dead, reſtoring the Deaf, the Lame, and the Blind, &c.* All which bore an excellent proportion to the great deſign of redeeming and ſaving Mankind. And if at any time there were
any

any mixture of Severity in the very Act, such as striking some dead by a Word's speaking, or putting others into the immediate Possession of the Devil by the Act of Excommunication; yet was even this done, either in kindness to Posterity, by fixing, in the first Institution of things, one or two standing *Pillars of Salt*, that might be for Example and Admonition, to after Ages against some Practices that might otherwise in time destroy Christianity: As in the first instance of *Ananias* and *Sapphira*, against the Sin of Hypocrisy. Or else, to some good purposes for the Persons themselves, as in the last Instance of Excommunication: So the Incestuous Person was adjudg'd by *St. Paul*, to deliver such an one to Satan for the Destruction of the Flesh, that the Spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus, 1 Cor. v. 5. None of these Miracles were such useless Ludicrous Actions as the *Romish* Authors have fill'd their Histories with. Such as that of *St. Berinus*, who being full sail for France, and half his Voyage over, finding he had forgot something, walks out upon the Sea, and returns back dry-shod. Such again, as *St. Francis*, bespeaking the Ass in the kind compellation of Brother, to stand quiet till he had done preaching, and not disturb the Solemnity. Such as *St. Mochua* by his Prayer and Staff hindring the poor Lambs from sucking their Dams, when they were running toward them with full Appetite. And *S. Finnianus* keeping off the Calf from the Cow, that they could neither of them move toward one another. Such in a word, as *St. Finnianus* and *St. Ruadanus* sporting their Miracles with each other, as if they had the Power given them for no other end but mere tryal of skill, or some pretty diversion to By-standers. *

* V. Colgan. in
Vit. Mochua &
Finniani.

2. As those Primitive Miracles were generally very beneficial to human Nature, so the Design of them was of the
grea-

greatest importance and significancy imaginable; and this both Design and the Miracles that should confirm it, plainly laid down before-hand in the Prophecies of the Old Testament. The Design was, to bring in and establish intirely an excellent Religion, a perfectly new dispensation of things; nay, further to abolish a former Model and Constitution of things, that had been formerly brought in and establish'd by the very same Argument of Miracles. It was not to establish any one particular Doctrine, that might be either in supplement to, or direct Contradiction of what had been hitherto delivered: But to settle one perfect and entire Standard, that should be the Rule and Measure of all that we were to believe and practise to the World's End.

It is true, the Jewish Dispensation as it was fix'd and model'd wholly at the appointment of God by the Hands of his Mediator *Moses*; so it was also enforc'd by such visible Powers from above that abundantly authoriz'd the Institution, and gave it that Confirmation (so long as it was fram'd and design'd to continue) that there should be no kind of Miracle pretended, but should *then* have its tryal by this Standard; and if any thing should be wrought with design to draw any off from their present Establishment, the *Sign* or *Wonder* should for that reason be rejected, and the Pretender to it, tho he had made himself signal in performing it, immediately condemn'd. *Deut.* 13. begin. But then, as things were then settled for a continuance of time only, and the change of the whole Scene was determined on the appearing of the promis'd *Messiah*; so this *Change* and the *Person* that should effect it, with all the mighty Works he should perform, and the vast success of these Miracles accordingly, were all pointed out before-hand by express

express Prophecies, utter'd under this very *Mosaick* Dispensation ; *The Lord thy God will raise unto thee a Prophet, from the midst of thee, of thy Brethren, like unto me, unto him ye shall hearken, Deut. xviii. 15.* To this Prophecy *St. Stephen* appeals in the defence he makes for himself, *Acts vii. 37.* And this is the whole Indication our Saviour thinks fit to give *John the Baptist*, that himself was the Person that *should come*, viz. *The blind receive their Sight, the Lepers are cleans'd, the Deaf hear, the Lame walk, the Dead are raised up, and to the Poor the Gospel is preached,* as had been prophesied before. Mat. xi. 5.

Now if the Cardinal could have shown, either that a new Dispensation of things was to be introduc'd, after what had been establish'd by Christ and his Apostles, or that what was to be introduc'd, should be also a fresh confirm'd by some new Endowments of Power from above, and that accordingly the Church of *Rome* upon just warrant had introduc'd, and by her Miracles had authoris'd this great Revolution : Here indeed had been a reasonable Proposal to our Faith. But, as there is no hint of this in the holy Scriptures, nor no Prediction of Miracles to confirm it; so if any such things be now pretended in any thing of this kind, they are no warrant to us to embrace it. There is, I confess a considerable *Change* foretold, and there is also a Prophecy as to those *Wonders* that should be wrought for the justifying of this *Change* ; but then, this *Change* hath no other denomination than that of *Apostacy* or *Falling away*, and the *Wonders* by which it must be justifi'd, are to be no other than *lying Wonders, with all deceiveableness of unrighteousness in them that perish, 2 Thes. ii. 9, 10.* And as to this *Change* and these *Wonders*, if those of the *Roman* Communion think fit to challenge them to themselves, we shall not contend with them in that affair.

Here therefore is the just foundation upon which those divine Miracles, that were wrought for confirmation of Christianity, do rest; *viz.* that the design of them was to bring in intirely a new Dispensation of things, and that this new dispensation of things had been pre-determin'd by God, and the Miracles that were to confirm it, when brought in, had their Testimonials beforehand by Phrophecy. And this Testimony S. Peter builds upon, as having something in it of greater certainty than the Miracles themselves, 2 Pet. 1. 16, 19. The Miracles he mentions, when he tells them, *We have not follow'd cunningly devis'd fables, when we made known unto you the Power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were Ey-witnesses of his Majesty: for he received from God the Father Honour, and Glory, when there came such a voice from the Excellent Glory, This is my beloved Son, &c. And this voice we heard when we were with him in the Mount: But then the Apostle adds, We have a MORE SURE Word of Prophecy, &c.*

And this is that I have propounded to shew, namely, that *meer* Miracles, without any other considerations at all, are not a sufficient *Note* or proof of any Church or Religion whatever. The word [*Miracles*] I take in the comprehensive sense, and mean all those *Signs* or *Wonders*, any prodigious Effects that appear to us out of the Course, and Order, and Power of Nature, which no one can *ordinarily* do himself, nor assign any reason in Nature for the doing of them; such things may certainly be done, and yet be no Proof of the Truth and Divinity of that Doctrine they would advance. It is not questionable, but there may be some Miracles wrought, wherein the *Finger of God* is so plainly discernible, that it would render those that reject *them* inexcusable. Such as once extorted that Confession

feſſion from the Magicians in *Egypt*, *Exod.* viii. 19 ; and ſuch as our Saviour did ſo avow, *Luke* xi. 20. that from thence he charges the Jews with the unpardonable Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, as may be obſerved by comparing *Luke* xi. from v. 15 to 20. with *Mat.* xii. from v. 24 to 32. But then, there have been conſiderable *Signs* ſhewn and *Wonders* done, of which no Reaſons in nature can be given, and yet make no Proof of their *own* Divinity, and conſequently not of *that* they were advanc'd for. Such were thoſe which *Jannes* and *Jambres* when they withſtood *Moses*, perform'd in *Pharaoh's* view : Theſe, thoſe of the Church of *Rome* with one conſent, do acknowledg to have been the meer Deluſions of the Devil. Otherwiſe if the meer doing ſuch great things ſhould be a juſt Proof of their being ſent from God, what ſhall we think of the Feats of *Apollonius Tyaneus*, as they are reported by *Philoſtratus*, if but the moſt, or ſome Part of what he in a juſt Hiſtory of eight Books, tells us, were true : As, *that he made a Tree ſpeak to him* ; that he *put to flight an Hobgoblin, which in the ſhape of a beautiful Virgin made love to him* : That he foretold many things, and particularly that *whiles he himſelf was in Ephesus, he declar'd the Death of the Emperor Domitian, at that inſtant, when they were actually committing it at Rome* : With abundance more of that Nature, which it were too tedious to recite. Indeed, it is not improbable, but that *Philoſtratus* was a right *Sophiſter* in the modern ſenſe ; and as very a Wag at invention for his *Apollonius*, as any *Monk* in Chriſtendom hath been for any of his *Saints* ; *Photius* his cenſure of him is, that the *whole Story is fabulous* ; and having inſtanc'd in that Paſſage of *Apollonius* filling ſome Veſſels with Water, and others with Wind, by which he could by turns water the Earth after a long drought,

and blow the Showers off, and dry the Earth again, he concludes, *Such like things as these, full of Delirancy, and many other things hath he prodigiously feign'd of him, that the whole study of a vain labour throughout all his eight Books is lost, and to no purpose* *.

* Παραπλησιάζειν τῶν ἀνείκελων με-
τὰ καὶ ἐξ ἑτέρας πλείους περατευσαμένων,
ἐν αὐτῷ δὲ λόγοις ἢ πᾶσι αὐτῷ της
ματαιοπορίας σπαδὴν κατενέχεται.
Phot. Cens. in mit. Philostr. Paris E-
dit.

† Εὐὼ διε σφόδρα πῖνα τὰ ἀνθρώπι-
να πόν τιανέω γερονέειν ἐγγύμιν. Καὶ
ἐπὶ γὰρ αὐτῆς ἐχέσθαι διανοίας ἐκὼν ἐί-
ναι βελομένην &c. Euseb. contra Hie-
rocl. Versus initium.

The same kind of esteem for this Au-
thor does *Eusebius* profess in his An-
swer to *Hierocles*, who in two Books
which he entitled *λόγους φιλαλήθεις*, had
set up *Apollonius* in competition with
the Holy Jesus. He questions the Ve-
racity of *Philostratus* in many things,
though he was willing to allow *Apollonius*
the reputation of a *Person of con-*
siderable Wisdom †. However let the

Truth of the matter be what it will, it is reasonable e-
nough to set these *Wonders of Apollonius* at least against
those Miracles which the Church of *Rome* boasts of di-
stinct from those which confirm'd our common Religi-
on, because the Authorities seem equal, and the motives
of credibility much of the same kind.

Again; What should we think of those Prodigies at
Delphos, as they are reported by *Pausanias* in *Phocic*. That
when *Brennus* and the *Gaules* came against it, and the
People miserably affrighted, had recourse to the Oracle,
the God there *bad them not fear, he assur'd them he would*
defend his own. Accordingly there break out *Earth-*
quakes, and Thunders and Lightnings, and Apparitions of
several of their Heroes formerly dead, all the day long. And
in the night time, unwonted and unsufferable rigors of Cold,
mighty Stones, and tops of the Rock torn from Parnassus,
and thrown so furiously amongst the Barbarians, that not
only one or two, but some hundreds of Men either as they
stood upon the guard, or were sleeping together, were slain by
them;

them; and by these means was the whole Army defeated, dissipated and destroy'd.

And thus indeed, the *Fathers* all along do not suppose but that very great things may be done by *Heathens*, or *Hereticks*, which yet can be no proof that either of them are in the right. *Origen* in his first Book against *Celsus* takes notice of the Objection *Celsus* makes about the Conjurers in *Egypt*, "That they could put *Demons* to flight, could blow off Diseases with their breath, could call up the Spirits of Heroes, could dress up the appearance of Tables furnish't with all manner of Delicacies, &c. Which things as to matter of fact he does not seem to deny the truth of, but to invalidate the force of them from a consideration of the Persons that wrought them, as being *Men of no good Lives*. And again, in his second Book against *Celsus*, he instances in this comparison of Miracles, and gives this note to discern those that are Divine from the Juggle of Imposters, or Cheats of the Devil; viz, "To observe the lives and manners of those that perform them, and also the effects when perform'd, that is, whether they bring hurt and damage to persons, or whether they correct their manners, &c.

* *S. Cyprian* discoursing of some that had broken off from the Church, and yet, supposing it possible for them to signalize themselves by Miracles, quoting that Passage of *St. John Ep.* 1. ch. 2. *They went out from us, but they were not of us*, tells us, that though the doing such Miracles, is an high and admirable thing, yet if they take not heed to go in the just and right way; it gives them no Title to the Kingdom of Heaven: where it is observable, that the *recti & justi itineris observatio*, is not to be under-

* Nam & prophetare, & *Demonia* excludere, & virtutes magnas in terris facere, sublimis utiq; & admirabilis res est, non tamen regnum cœlestē consequitur quisquis in his omnibus invenitur, nisi recti & justi itineris observatione gradiatur. *Cypr. de Unitat. Eccles.*

derstood

derstood meerly a good and vertuous Life; for that is acknowledged on all hands, that some Persons inwardly wicked, but outwardly holding Communion with the true Church, might work Miracles, as probably *Judas* did amongst the other Disciples. But *St. Cyprian* means it of those that had turn'd out of the right way, and thro' Schism had broken off from the true Church, as the tenor of that Discourse carries it.

† Ποτίεα ὄνω κακεμέγα προ-
σπίμεν εὐχαριστήν, καὶ ὅτι πλέον
ἐκείων ἢ λόγον τὴν ἐπιπλήτως πα-
φύρεα καὶ ἐρυθρὴν ἀναφαινεῖται πίει, ὡς
δοκεῖν τὴν ἀπο τῶν ὑπὸ ταῦτα χα-
ριν, τὸ αἷμα τοῦ ἐαυτοῦς ἐκχεῖ ἐν τῇ
ποσειδι δια τῆς ἐπιπλήσεως αὐτοῦ, καὶ
ὑπὸ μείξεσθαι τὰς παρόδους ὡς ἐκείνη
ζωοποιεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα, ἵνα καὶ εἰς αὐ-
τὸς ἐπιμβροῇ ἢ δια τῆς μάσεως τὰς
κλητίζμενης χάρις. *Irene advers. He-*
res. l. 1. c. 9.

† *Irenæus* tells us of the prodigious Errors of *Marcus* the Heretick, and yet two of the Wonders he did, viz. "When he was consecrating, or giving of Thanks over the Cup mixt with Wine, drawing out his Invocations to a mighty length, he made the Cup appear of a Purple, or Red Colour; and that it should seem that that Grace that comes from the place

"which is above all things, did by the power of his Invocation distil its own Blood into the Cup, that those that were present should vehemently desire to taste of the same draught, that so that very Grace boasted of by the Magician, might actually flow into them too. He further instances in a Magic Trick he had of filling a greater Cup with a much less, and to the view of others, inspiring some of the seduc'd Women with the gift of Prophecy, and the like. This passage of *Irenæus* is quoted *verbatim* by *Epiphanius*, who also calls this *Marcus*, τῆς μαγικῆς κυβέας ἐμπειρότατον; one perfectly skill'd in the Magic Art *.

* *Epiphani. in Heres. 34. Marcosii.*

(b) *August. Exposit. in Evang. Johann. Tractat. 13. versus 34. et seq.*

(b) *St. Austin* directs thus, "Let no Man, saith he, vend Fables amongst you. Both *Pontius* wrought a Miracle, and *Donatus* pray'd, and God answer'd him from Heaven. First, either they are deceived themselves,

“ selves, or else they deceive others. However, sup-
 “ pose he could remove Mountains, yet saith the Apo-
 “ stle, *If I have not Charity I am nothing.* Let us see
 “ whether he hath not Charity, I should have believed
 “ it, if he had not divided the Unity [*of the Church*]
 “ for God hath warned me against such *Wonder-Mongers* * Istos mirabi-
 “ if I may so call them: *In the latter Days there shall arise* liarios.
 “ *false Prophets, doing Signs and Wonders, &c.* Mark xiii.
 “ *Ergo cautos nos fecit sponsus, quia miraculis decipi non de-*
 “ *bemus.* Therefore hath our Lord warned us, because we
 “ should not be deceived by Miracles. And so he goes on
 “ with that which we find in *Decret. part. 2. Caus. 1.*
 “ *Quest. 1. cap. 56. Teneamus ergo unitatem fratres mei,*
 “ *præter Unitatem, & qui facit miracula, nihil est.* Let us
 “ hold fast the Unity, out of this Unity, even he that works
 “ Miracles is nothing. Peter the Apostle, saith he, rais'd
 “ the Dead, Simon Magus did many things; there were
 “ many Christians that could do none of these things,
 “ neither what Peter nor what Simon did, but what
 “ did they rejoice in? That their Names were waitten in
 “ Heaven.

This Father hath many other Passages of this kind in
 his Book *de Unitate Ecclesie*, but they are already so largely
 quoted in that excellent Preface before the *School of the*
Eucharist lately made English, that I refer the Reader
 thither, not only for that, but also for the whole Argu-
 ment about Miracles, which might justly have superse-
 ded this Discourse upon the *Note of Miracles*, had it been
 so ordered in its due Place: So that *Miracles* meerly, we
 see in the Judgment of the Fathers, were never account-
 ed a full and adæquate *Note* of any true Church. Which,
 in Truth, the Cardinal himself, after the great Foun-
 dation he seem'd to have laid as to the sufficiency of Mi-
 racles, does in some measure yield, when he tells us in
 this

Ex miraculis
demonstratur
Ecclesia, non
quoad eviden-
tiam vel certi-
tudinem rei,
sed quoad evi-
dentiam & cer-
titudinem cre-
dibilitatis. *Bel.*
l. iv. c. 14.
* Espenæus
in 2 ad Tim.

this very same Chapter, *That the Church is demonstrated by Miracles, not as to the evidence and certainty of the thing, but only as to the evidence and certainty of Credibility.* Which is as much as to say, that *Miracles* may be a *Note* of the Church, and they may not be so, that is such a kind of *Note* by which we may give a good guess at the true Church, but cannot be certain. For as one of their own Writers expresseth it, *Miracula Deo & Diabolo, Christo & Antichristo sunt communia* *. *Miracles are common to God and the Devil, to Christ and Antichrist.*

II. If *Miracles* in general, are no sufficient *Note* or *Proof* of any Church whatever, much less are those *Miracles* alledg'd in the Church of *Rome* in Confirmation of those particular Doctrines and Practices wherein we of the Reform'd Church differ from them, much less (I say) are they any just *Note* of their Church, or Evidence of the Truth of those Doctrines. There are a Variety of *Miracles* offer'd to us in their *Histories* or in their *Legends* in Confirmation of the several Doctrines of *Sacramental Confession, Adoration of Images and Reliques, Invocation of Saints, Purgatory, the bodily Presence in the Eucharist, and the Holiness* of particular Persons that have flourish'd in their Church. Now as to this, we are to consider these things :

First, That we do not observe any ground throughout the whole Scriptures, either of the *Old* or *New Testament*, to expect any *Miracle* for the Confirmation of any particular Doctrine whatever.

Secondly, That many of those Doctrines which these *Miracles* are alledg'd in Confirmation of, are so far from being expressly asserted or warranted in the Holy Scriptures, that they rather bear a direct Contrariety.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, That there is no tolerable ground for Certainty as to the truth of most of those Miracles which the *Romanists* do make the *Glory* of their Church.

First, That we do not observe any ground throughout the whole Scriptures either of the *Old* or *New Testament* to expect any Miracle for the Confirmation of any particular Doctrine whatever. The Miracles under the *Mosaick* Dispensation, were to confirm and establish *that*: And the Miracles perform'd by Christ and his Apostles (as I have already intimated) were to bring in and establish the *New Law of Faith*. We read nothing throughout the whole Jewish State, that may make us suppose that any of the Prophets after the Death of *Moses* (tho they were sometimes endu'd with the Power of doing this or that Miracle) that they ever taught any new Doctrine which had not been deliver'd by *Moses*, or which they undertook to confirm by any Miracle. It is true they sometimes wrought a Miracle, as a *Credential* for themselves and their own Character, to shew that they were Prophets sent from God. But then, the whole Errand of their Commission, was to explain *Moses's* Law; to awaken Men to a stricter Conformity to what they had so provokingly violated; to denounce heavy Judgments upon their Disobedience; to speak encouraging things to a distress'd and persecuted Church; and in a Word, to fore-tell the Events of future Ages, and particularly point out the Days of the *Messiah*, and Revolutions of Christianity. Again, we find that under the Dispensation of the Gospel, the Miracles which our Saviour and his Apostles wrought, were to warrant the

N n

whole

whole new Oeconomy. And tho one main thing the Apostles were empowr'd for, was to bear Testimony to the *Resurrection* of their Master, yet was this chiefly as the whole frame of the Gospel depended wholly upon the Truth and Evidence of this great Event ; because if it were not as fully made out that he rose again, as that he dy'd, their *Preaching had been vain*, and their Attempts to abolish the Law and Constitution of *Moses*, had been an unwarrantable Usurpation.

Nor do we find that tho in a following Age or two the Church was probably bless'd with those miraculous Powers, till the Gospel was diffusively enough propagated ; yet do we not find that they wrought any one Miracle for the establishment of any one particular Doctrine, much less any Doctrine that had not been delivered by the Apostles before them, nor enter'd into the Substance and Fundamentals of the Gospel. Which leads to the next thing, *viz.*

Secondly, That many of those Doctrines, which these Miracles are alledg'd in Confirmation of, are so far from being expressly asserted or warranted in the Holy Scriptures, that they rather bear a direct Contrariety. *E.g.* The Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, upon which is superstructed the *Adoration of the Host*, which *Adoration* (supposing the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* not to be fundamentally true) is, by the Confession of several of their own Authors, down-right Idolatry. Again ; the Doctrine of *worshipping Images* we cannot but think to be against the express Law of God. The Doctrine of *praying to Saints departed* seems immediately to intrench upon the Office of the Holy Jesus as he is our alone Mediator,

diator, and gives to the *Creature* incommunicable Attributes of the *Creator*, as *Omniscience* and *Omnipresence*. And, to name no more, the Doctrine of *Purgatory*, with its appendent Doctrines about *Indulgences*, *Satisfaction*, and the like, they seem to alter the whole Scheme of the Gospel-Institution, by taking off from the infiniteness of Divine Mercy, and sufficiency of Christ's Satisfaction.

Now these are the Doctrines wherein the *Glory* of the *Roman Miracles* have been generally concern'd. So long therefore as we think we have so much in the Holy Scriptures in bar against the Doctrines themselves, we cannot but think we have most just prejudices against the Miracles by which the truth of these Doctrines are advanced or supported: We are directed by the Apostle, *to prove all things, and to hold fast that which is good*, 1 Thess. v. 21. And *not to believe every Spirit, but to try the Spirits whether they be of God*, 1 Joh. iv. 1. By the *Spirits*, doubtless must be meant no other than *those* that pretended to *Prophecy*, to *Revelations*, and to the Power of some Miracles. Now it is very true, in that first Age wherein this Apostle wrote, among the *diversity of Gifts*, there was this of *discerning of Spirits*, that adorn'd some Men, 1 Cor. xii. 10. It is not probable that the Apostle caution'd *these* against *false Spirits*, for they were empower'd to *discern* them: But the Warning belongs to the whole Rank of Christians, as appears by the plain Rule he gives to try them by; *Ver. 2. Hereby know ye the Spirit of God; every Spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the Flesh, is of God, &c.* This seems to point at a sort of *Gnosticks* in that Age, that would be allegorizing the whole History of our Saviour's Life and

Death, and Resurrection, and make it no real thing, but purely Mystical and Figurative. Whoever therefore would pretend to the Gift of Prophecy or Miracle, and yet deliver this kind of Divinity, he must be rejected notwithstanding all the shew he might make. So in proportion still are we warranted to *try the Spirits*, to judge of any Powers of Miracle that are produc'd in Confirmation of a Doctrine that may intrench upon the great Offices of the Blessed Jesus, or look new and foreign to those *Revelations* which himself and his Apostles have deliver'd to us as the sum and upshot of Christianity. *Tho we* (saith the Apostle) *or an Angel from Heaven preach any other Gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed*, Gal. i. 8. "*Tho we*, the Apostles that are vested with so visible a "Power of Miracles, nay *tho an Angel from Heaven* (and "certainly if an Angel should come, he might be capable of doing things beyond the order or course of Nature, as to us at least, as hath been often seen by "what Devils have perform'd) *tho such an one* should "be propagating other Doctrines, and that, by "all the most powerful Methods that such spiritual "Beings are capable of using, they are to be held "accursed.

Our Saviour gives the Caution to all his Followers in every Age, *That there shall arise false Christs, and false Prophets, and shall shew great Signs and Wonders, inso-much that if it were possible, they shall deceive the very Elect*. Behold I have told you before, Matth. xxiv. 24, 25. I shall only add the great Criterion of Miracles in the old Testament. Deut. xiii. 1, 2, 3. *If there arise among you a Prophet, or a Dreamer of Dreams, and giveth thee*

a Sign or Wonder, and the Sign or the Wonder come to pass, whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let us go after other Gods (which thou hast not known) and let us serve them; thou shalt not hearken to the Words of that Prophet, or that Dreamer of Dreams: for the Lord your God proveth you, to know whether you love the Lord your God with all your Heart, and with all your Soul. So long therefore as the Doctrines which these sort of Miracles are brought to confirm, are in dispute betwixt us, and after all the impartial Enquiry we can make, we think that several of them do war directly against the received Doctrines of our Faith, *this Glory of Miracles* is vainly urg'd to us as a *Note* of the true Church, when we are warn'd even against Miracles themselves, where they are pleaded to establish them. All this upon supposal that all these *pretended* Miracles were actually true. But then,

Thirdly, There is no tolerable ground of Certainty, as to matter of Fact, of most of those Miracles, which the *Romanists* do make the *Glory* of *their* Church. The first instance of any Miracle wrought by the Relicks of a *Martyr*, is that Story of the Bones of *Babylas*. That Martyr having been Interr'd in *Daphne* a Suburb of *Antioch*, when *Julian* the Apostate came to consult *Apollo's* Oracle in that place, near an hundred Years after this Martyr's Interment, he could procure no Answer. Upon this, the Oracle was conjur'd at least to give a reason of this Silence; accordingly it answered, *Because the Bones of Babylas lay so near his Temple.* I do not find this Story call'd much into Question by the gravest Authors, nor indeed can we much wonder that the Devil should for once give so open a Deference to the Remains

mains of an Holy Man, when by one such an Act he hath so effectually improv'd his Interests and Kingdom to so great an advance of Superstition afterward, in all these fond Devotions that have been since pay'd to the Reliques of pretended Saints, and all those lew'd Fables of innumerable Miracles acted at their Shrines, which probably have been coyn'd upon this first occasion of *Babylas*.

There is another Story almost of as ancient a Date; and that is of St. *Ambrose* having by Vision reveal'd to him where the Bones of *Gervasius* and *Protasius* the Martyrs lay, which he took up, and after considerable Miracles wrought, such as curing a blind Butcher, &c. he repos'd the Venerable Reliques under the Altar of a new Church which he had then built and dedicated. I am not willing to bring a Question upon this neither, as to the truth of it, because I find it not rejected by the best Writers, as well as told by St. *Ambrose* himself, and the Reason of some Miracles of that time might be in Vindication of the Catholick Faith against the Pestilence of *Arianism* that rag'd so fiercely at that time. Yet there are some Circumstances that render it something suspicious; as, why that Holy Man should think of not building or dedicating a new Church, unless he could be furnish'd with some Reliques? There seems a good pretty tang of Superstition in the very Thought; and then, the bulk of those Bodies when they were found: They seem of a Gygantick Race, few of which I presume were ever of a Constitution for Martyrdom.

Invenimus mira magnitudinis viros duos, ut prisca etas ferebat. We found two Men of wonderful bulk, such as olden Times were wont to produce *. Certainly the Age of

* Ambr. Epist.
ad Marcel.
Sopor. l. 7.

of *Decius*, wherein they suffer'd, did not produce Men of a much larger size, than the Age of *Gratian* and *Valentinian*. But still let this Story, as to matter of Fact, be receiv'd as true: doubtless it hath been followed in later Ages with thousands of the like kind, that have been so prodigiously ridiculous and improbable, that several of the considering Writers in the Church of *Rome* have been asham'd of them, have profess'd their disdain at them, and left their Censure upon them as plainly false and impossible. *Petrus Abbas Cluniacensis* had the Wit and Honesty, even in the XIIth Age, to complain of these Tales; *Nosti quantum me pigeant falsa in Ecclesiâ Dei Cantica* †. &c. You know how irksom these false Hymns in the Church of God must needs be to me. And a little after in the same Epistle adds, *Mendacia ad minus 24 Canticum id citato percurrrens animo, reperi*. He found at least four and twenty Lies in one Hymn of *Benedict*. *Lindanus*, one of their own Writers, cites a Bishop of *Lyons*, saying, that he had corrected the Antiphonary, *Amputatis quæ superflua, levia, falsa, blasphema, phantastica multa videbantur*; having cut off many things which seem'd superfluous, trivial, false, blasphemous and fantastical: And then adds of his own, that if that Bishop had liv'd to see the Missals in his days, *Deum Immortalem quo ea nomine pingeret!* Good God by what Name would he have described them! * *Ludovicus Vives*, another of their own Authors, speaks of their Golden Legend, *quam indigna Divis & Hominibus Sanctorum Historia*, &c. How unworthy either of Saints or Men is that History, which I know not why they should call the Golden Legend, when it was writ by a Man of an Iron Forehead and leaden Understanding †. We are told also by *Melchior Canus*, that he cannot deny but that even their best Writers, especially in

† *Petr. Abbas Cluniacensis*. l. 5. Epist. 89.

* *Lindan. de Interpretandis Scripturis*. l. 3. c. 3.

† *Lad. Vitz. In fine lib. 2. de Corrupt. Artis.*

* Quamquam
negare non
possumus viros
aliquando gra-
vissimos, &c.
*Melch. Can.
Loc. Theol. 1.
II. C. 9.*

describing the Miracles of the Saints, have gathered up scattered Rumours, and transferred them to Posterity in their Writings, herein, too much indulging themselves, or the ordinary sort of Believers, whom they suppos'd not only ready to believe, but also vehemently desirous of such Miracles *. And of the Legends, he declares he could not to this day meet with one Story that he could allow. This was the Opinion and Esteem the wiser Authors in the Church of Rome have left behind them of such Stories as these, however Father Cressy in his *Church-History*, in this very Age of ours, and in a Nation where there seems no Inclination to such unreasonable Credulity, hath thought fit to lick up the Spittle of the idlest Monks, and to avow the absurdest of all their Fictions.

The *Centuriators* have taken pains for several Centuries, both to reckon up the Doctrines which the Church of Rome hath brought in, and also in every Age to affix the particular Miracles that are pretended to justify those Doctrines. It might create an infinite *Nausea* in the Reader, should I follow that Method, or indeed examine those Persons and their Miracles, whom the Cardinal hath rang'd in order from the *seventh* to the *sixteenth* Age.

However (1.) as to the Persons whom he makes so famous for Miracles, I shall examine one or two, to give you a taste of the uncertainty of all the rest.

And (2.) as to the Doctrines; because the Cardinal hath instanced in some, particularly in *Confirmation of Christ's bodily Presence in the Eucharist*, I shall examine one or two of them too.

1. As

1. As to the Persons. In the twelfth Age, (a) the Cardinal brings in *St. Bernard*, who (as he tells us) was the Father of the Monks, and most devoutly addicted to the See of Rome; that he was famous for more Miracles, than any of the Saints whose Lives are at present extant. Whereas if we consult *St. Bernard* himself, he is comforting himself and others, under the defect of Miracles in his Age. * He tells us, that Miracles are not so properly meritorious, as the Indications of good Men. Who (saith he) now casteth out Devils, speaketh with Tongues, destroys Serpents, &c. Nay seems to account the great Work wrought upon the Hearts of Believers, wherein he and others were made the blessed Instruments, to be equivalent to Miracles. "The first Work, saith he, of that Faith which worketh by Love, is the Compunction of the Heart, by which, without doubt, Devils are cast out, when Sin is rooted out of the Heart. And then, those that believe in Christ, speak with Tongues too, when the old things are vanish'd from their Lips, they do not speak for the future with the old Tongue of their first Parents, who declin'd into Words of Wickedness. So when by Compunction of Heart and Confession of the Mouth, former Sins are blot- ted out, they must necessarily destroy Serpents, that is, extinguish the venomous Suggestions, &c. And thus he goes on in that allusive way, accommodating the whole Christian Life to something of those miraculous Acts in the Primitive Days. But let the ingenious Reader judg now; Is it not probable that had *St. Bernard* been so very illustrious for Miracles, beyond all the Saints, whose Lives had been ever written, instead of apologizing for the defect of Miracles, or drawing the equivalent between the Conver-

(a) *Epistol. de Nat. Eccles. l. iv. c. 14. Romanis Pontificibus addictissimus, pluribus Miraculis claruit quam ullus Sanctorum quorum vite scripta exstant.*
* *Bernard. Serm. 1. In die Ascensionis. Non tam merita sunt, quam indicia meritorum— Quis daemonia ejicit, linguis novis loquitur, serpentes tollit, &c. Primum enim opus fidei per dilectionem operantis cordis compunctio est, in qua sine dubio ejiciuntur demonia, cum eradantur e corde peccata, &c. Bern. ubi sup.*

sion of a Sinner, and casting out Devils, or speaking with Tongues, he would not have put in a word or two here, of what great things God had enabled him to do?

Again ; it is observable of St. *John Damascen*, concerning whom they tell us, that his Hand having been cut off by the *Saracens* for the Profession of the Faith ; he praying before the Image of the Blessed Virgin, and falling asleep, upon his awaking found his Hand restor'd, only a Seam of Blood visible where it was cut off and joyn'd again. Now, if we consult himself, he tells us of the Doctors and Pastors of the Church, that succeeded the Apostles in their Grace and Dignity, that *they* having obtain'd the enlightning Grace of God's Spirit, did both by the *Power of Miracles* and *Eloquence of Speech* enlighten blind Men, and reduce the Wanderer into the way,

* Damascen. Orthodox. Fid.
l. 1. c. 3.

|| Cum modestiā & viro Christiano dignā humilitate de seipso loquitur B. Pater Damascenus, &c.

* ἡμεῖς δὲ μὴδὲ τῶν θαυμάτων, &c. But we (saith he) who have neither the Gift of Miracle nor of Speech, &c. Is this spoken like a Man of Miracle. || His Commentator indeed would bring him off, as if it were his Modesty to speak thus of himself, and gives the instance of S. *Paul*, confessing himself least of all the Apostles : But certainly were he never so modest, he would not lie for the matter by any means, especially when he made mention of the Miracles that former Ages had produc'd. St. *Paul* (as humbly as he thought and spoke of himself) made no scruple upon occasion to mention the mighty Powers that God had endu'd him with ; and so did St. *Peter* too : Nor was it other than their Duty sometimes to do it, both to own the Gift with Thankfulness, and to make use of it as an Argument to enforce their Do-

ctrines

Doctrines upon those they had to deal with. Thus much for the Persons.

2. For the Doctrines: It would be too tedious to run through the various Heads of Doctrine, which they boast of as confirm'd by Miracles, many of which are so monstrously ridiculous, so highly improbable, so confessedly fabulous, so perfectly needless and to no purpose, that they are not worth one minute's regard either to examin or expose them. The *Legends* of the Saints, and the *School of the Eucharist* lately published in English; I may add, Father *Cressy's Church History*, will abundantly furnish the Reader, that is at leisure to dip into that way of Learning. However, because our Cardinal hath thought fit to make *this* of *Miracles* his *last* Argument for the Proof of Christ's bodily Presence in the holy Sacrament; and, besides pointing at great numbers, hath himself insisted upon six or seven which he thought of the greatest weight (e): I shall examine one or two of them.

(e) V. Bellar.
De sac. Eu-
char. l. 3. c. 8.

It is a very considerable Miracle the Cardinal mentions from *Paulus Diaconus* in the Life of Saint *Gregory*, which I rather pick out, because I find our *Putney Convert* very fond of it. It is of a Woman that laugh'd while in the distribution of the Sacramental Bread, she heard it call'd the Body of our Lord, "when she knew she had made it with her own Hands. Upon this St. *Gregory* prayed, and "the outward species of Bread was turned into visible "Flesh, by which the Woman was recovered to the "true Faith, and the whole Assembly mightily confirmed.

Consensus Ve-
terum. p. 69.

This were a good significant Proof of Transubstantiation indeed, if it were but true. Though here also a Man might as justly question his Senses at the sight of such a Change, as he must always renounce them in the belief of the thing it self. But there are considerable difficulties before the truth of the Story will go down with *Us Unbelievers*.

For (1.) It is a very unlucky thing that never any such Miracle was yet wrought in view of any of those Churches that do professedly deny this Doctrine. In the second Council of *Nice Actio 7. Therasius* the President puts this grave Question, *What is the cause that Miracles are not wrought by any of our Images?* and as gravely answers it himself, *Because Miracles are not given to them that believe, but to them that believe not.* It is indeed what St. Paul intimates concerning the Gift of Tongues, which most Interpreters apply to all other Miracles. We are the Persons to whom this Ocular Demonstration should be made; and because it hath not yet upon any Occasion or Challenge whatever, been made amongst us, we may reasonably question the truth of this, or any other Story of this kind which they tell amongst themselves.

1 Cor. xiv. 22.

Besides (2.) this Story was writ by *Paulus Diaconus* about two hundred years after the Death of this *Gregory*, and in an Age as Fabulous as any hath yet been.

I add, lastly, That the very Doctrine of Transubstantiation had hardly got the least footstep in the Church

Church in the days of St. Gregory ; it cannot be pick'd out of any of his Writings, no not in that passage which Mr. *Sclater* hath quoted from him *, which, I presume, is the best that his Friend *Bellarmino* could direct him to , and which hath nothing further in it, than a pretty high Flight which several of the Fathers would take when they mention the Holy Sacrament, and what may be well enough defended by those that reject Transubstantiation to the uttermost.

* Consens. veterum. p. 69.

The Cardinal gives us another Miracle from *Paschafius. de Corpore Dom. c. 14.* which our late learned Reasoner is very fond of too || . “ The Story “ is of a certain Godly Priest, that was in great distress to see with his bodily Eyes the Shape of “ him, whom he certainly believ'd actually present “ under the *Species* of Bread and Wine. At length “ he obtain'd what he so long desir'd, and beheld “ the Body of Christ in Human Shape, but in the “ Figure of a Child, which he had also most vehemently desired.

|| Consens. veterum. p. 97.

Now as to this, beside the Authority of the Book out of which this is taken, let us consider to what purpose this Miracle was wrought, or the Story of it told in this place. The Cardinal is upon the Proof of Christ's *Bodily Presence* in the Sacrament, and this *Bodily Presence* is so receiv'd by those of the *Roman* Communion, that they believe that *very* Body, which was slain upon the Cross, was buried, was rais'd again, and went up into Heaven, that that *very numerical* Body is *substantially* and *intirely* under the *Species* of Bread and Wine, the Substance of which is perfectly vanish'd. Let me

me therefore ask Mr. *Sclater* of *Putney*, because his *Friend* the Cardinal cannot now answer for himself; Did our Blessed Saviour die an Infant, and rise again an Infant, and does he now sit at the Right Hand of God in the Figure of a Child, or in his Infant-state? If not (and I hope he will say it is blasphemous to think so) how then did this *Godly Presbyter* see the Body of Christ, as he supposed it transubstantiated under the *Species* of Bread and Wine? The Substance of the Bread* and Wine was gone into that Body that had been crucified. What! was there Transubstantiation upon Transubstantiation, and the proper Body of our Saviour gone into the Substance of a Child's Body? It may be this made him in love with those Liturgies he quotes, † wherein *the Priest* is blessing God for vouchsafing by him to change the immaculate Body of Christ and his precious Blood, &c. To change it into what? perhaps from that of a grown Man, to that of a Child or Infant. Well, but the Cardinal is something more wary in the Story than the venturesom Gentleman of *Putney*. For he tells us the *Priest* had *desir'd to see him in this Shape*. If so, and if he was thus far indulg'd, what kind of Argument is this for Transubstantiation? What Conviction is this, that the very self-same Body that hung upon the Cross, and is at the right Hand of God, is brought down under the *Species* of Bread and Wine? But the Author adds in *Bellarmin*, That it *pleaseth God to work Miracles upon a twofold account; sometimes to confirm the doubting, and sometimes for the Consolation of those that fervently love him* *. This we are to suppose then was not to confirm the *Godly Priest*

† Confens. Venerum, p. 28.

* Bellarm. de Sac. Euchar. ubi sup.

Priest in his Faith, he needed not that, but to give him great Consolation. But what? Are we to suppose so *Godly* a *Presbyter* as this was, to be more ravish'd in the view of his Saviour under the shape of a smiling, playing Babe, than in that very Form wherein he finish'd the great work of our Salvation upon the Cross, and wherein he is now triumphing Above, in the Accomplishment of what he undertook? Let *him* believe it that can make the Doctrine of Transubstantiation the Reason of his Conversion from the Church of England to that of Rome, and can strengthen his Faith in it more firmly from some *Rabbinical Prophecies*, and such a Story as this is †.

† Consensus
Veter. p. 21,
22. and so on.
and p. 97.

I would have examined a Third Story of *St. Anthony* of Padua, but I find this done so learnedly and so effectually to my Hands by a most ingenious Pen (a), that I had rather refer the Reader thither, than needlessly swell the bulk of this Note. Considering therefore how little likelihood of Truth there is in many Stories of this kind; or where, (as to matter of Fact) some of them may have been possibly true, yet how reasonably they may be accounted the Tricks and Impostures of Evil Spirits; I cannot but close this Head with an Expression of *St. Austin* to the *Donatists* upon the same Pretensions they had to Miracles, *Removentur ista vel signa mendacium hominum, vel portenta fallacium spirituum.* Away with these, either Fictions of Lying Men, or Illusions of deceiving Spirits. For certainly, they are neither the Note, nor can be the Glory of any true Church. And therefore,

(a) Reflections
on the Rom. De-
votions. p. 326,
327, &c.

August. de
Unitate Eccl'es.
c. 16.

III. Lastly ;

III. Lastly ; We of the *Reform'd Religion*, as we do not pretend to the working of Miracles in our Age, so if we did, we could pretend to prove nothing by them but what hath been already sufficiently prov'd by the Miracles of Christ and his Apostles.

We most humbly and thankfully adore the great Condescensions of Divine Grace, that hath been pleas'd in his first planting of Christianity, so *fully* and so *unquestionably* to confirm all the *necessary* Articles of our Belief, with such *strong* and *convincing* Miracles. The Report of *these* Miracles we most firmly believe: We do without the least hæsitancy own the Almighty Power of God in them, and entirely embrace *all* that Faith which they were design'd to confirm and establish. We know of *no other Doctrines* that we have any *Obligation* to receive, than what are deliver'd to us in the Holy Scriptures, and so effectually seal'd to us. We have nothing *new* to put off or back with the presence of Miracles, but are always ready to reject both the *Doctrines* when they are propos'd, and the *Miracles* when they are offer'd in Defence of them. We have no need to follow *cunningly devis'd Fables*, since we have a *more sure Word of Prophecy*, to which, by God's Grace, we will take heed. And therefore all Miracles at this time of the Day are superfluous to us: for if the Doctrine be not propos'd to us before-hand in the written Word, ten thousand Miracles could not warrant it; if it be to be found there, they may save the trouble of a
Mi-

Miracle, because that Word of God hath been sufficiently confirm'd in that Way already. This Word of God is the *sure* Rule of our Faith, the *great* Character of our Hopes, and if the hearty Belief of *this*, and humble Conformity of Life to it, will not secure us at last, we are contented to lose all the Rewards which this *Gospel* hath made us to expect.

And therefore, since Matters stand thus with us, the Cardinal shew'd himself either a very perverse Disputer, or was dropt asleep when he makes *Luther* in vain attempting to restore a drown'd Man to Life; or when he tells a much lewder Story of *Calvin* out of *Bolsec*. "He represents him
"as hiring a poor Man to feign himself Dead, that
"so he might have the Reputation of an *Holy and*
"*Glorious Prophet of God*. The poor Man takes the
"Hire, feigns himself dead. *Calvin* comes to him,
"prays over him, and then takes him by the
"Hand, commands him once and again, in the
"face of a great Assembly, in the Name of God
"to rise; but the poor Wretch was beyond the
"reach of his Voice, for he was dead indeed,
"and all this Pageantry of his, by the severe Judgment of God, turned into sad earnest. This he tells, and much more at length, with most particular Circumstances; and yet, in the very next Paragraph but one after this Story * the Cardinal himself quotes *Calvin* and others of the Reformation, pleading in Defence of themselves, *That their Adversaries do not deal fairly with them, to call for Miracles from them, when they pub-*

Bellarmin. de
Notis Eccles.
l. iv. c. 14.

* Bellarm. ubi sup. Respondet *Calvinus* in prefat. Institut. & alii, Nos injuriam eis facere, quod ab eis Miracula exigimus, cum ipsi Doctrinam antiquam, & innumeris Miraculis ab Apostolis & Martyribus confirmatam prædicent.

lish no other than the *ANCIENT* Doctrine, confirmed by innumerable Miracles of old by the Apostles and Martyrs. What! Do they openly declare that they neither pretend to Miracles, nor need them in Confirmation of that Doctrine which they preach, because so *Ancient* and so well confirm'd already, by innumerable Miracles wrought by Apostles and Martyrs themselves, and yet shall it be threatpt upon them that they betake themselves to such little Arts of hiring poor Wretches to dissemble their Death, that these may have the Vain-Glory of raising them? Either the Cardinal should not have told this Tale, or he should not have reported the Answer which *Calvin* and others have offer'd in Defence of themselves.

To Conclude; We are so assur'd of the *whole* sum of our Faith, that it is what our Blessed Lord and his Apostles have delivered to us, and we so firmly believe the Truth of those Miracles which *they* wrought to support and justify it, that we esteem it perfectly needless and superfluous to pretend to them now. Nay let me add, that we cannot but think that our very Contempt of *those Miracles* which the late fabulous Ages have vended in the World, confirms us more effectually in the Belief of those which the first Publishers of the Gospel wrought. Because, it seems the great Artifice of that *Father of Lies*, when he saw he could not at first either defeat the *Power* of those Miracles by imitating them himself, or suppress the notice and conveyance of them to the World, he would by an after-Game in a more lazy and stupid Age, advance some *Wonders* of his own framing,

ming, some of them very absurd, and ridiculous, all of them very remarkable for their Superstition, and so bring the thinking and considering Man to suspect, that if *those Miracles* have the same Foundation, and were carryed on with the same Designs, as *those* by which Christ and his Apostles confirm'd Christianity, that then, they may be all equally subject to Dispute and Question. And it is well for those Countries where these Miracles are most boasted of, and seemingly believ'd; if they don't find a very sensible growth of Atheism and Irreligion amongst them.

T H E E N D.

The Reader is requested to correct (among some few others of more easy Observation) these following Mistakes.

PAg. 250. L. 10. Marg. r. παρρησιών. P. 251. l. 19. r. Antoninus. P. 256. l. 30. r. the Change. P. 258. l. 8. r. Prophecy. P. 260. l. 4. Marg. r. χατηνάλωτας. L. 5. Marg. r. mir. L. 8. Marg. r. διανοίας. P. 261. l. 18. r. Impostors. P. 262. l. 2. Marg. r. περισπαιόμενοι. L. 3. Marg. r. ευχαριστήν. L. 4. Marg. r. ἀναφαίνεσθαι. L. 5. Marg. r. ὅλα. L. 7. Marg. r. ποθητά. L. 9. Marg. r. πύμαθ. P. 263. l. 20. r. written. P. 273. l. 24. Marg. r. eradicantur. P. 276. l. 11. r. Tharasmus.

L O N D O N,

Printed by *J. D.* for *Richard Chiswell* at the Rose and Crown in *St. Paul's Church-Yard*, 1687.

The Twelfth Note of the CHURCH
EXAMINED,

VIZ

The LIGHT of PROPHECY.

Duodecima Nota est Lumen Propheticum. Bellarm. L. iv. c. 15.
de Notis Ecclesiæ.

I M P R I M A T U R.

July 8. 1687.

Guil. Needham.

BY the *Light of Prophecy* two Things may be meant.

I. That Divine Revelation, whereby a Man is enabled to foretell that such or such contingent Events will certainly come to pass. In which Sense, altho they may be said to have the Light of Prophecy who are instructed what Events another hath foretold, and to whom it doth appear also that God hath communicated the certain knowledg of those Events to him; yet in common Speech, the *Light of Prophecy* as it signifies the Revelation of Future Events, is usually restrained to the Person to whom such Revelation was immediately made. For he only is called a *Prophet* who makes known to others those Future Events,

2 Pet. i. 21.

vents, the knowledg whereof himself had received not from any other Man, but from God, *i. e.* who himself *spake as he was moved by the Holy Ghost.* Or,

Vers. 19.

2. The Testimony that is given by the fulfilling of Prophecies to some Doctrine that was designed to be confirmed by it. And thus the *Christian* Religion was demonstrated to be the True Religion by the *Light of Prophecy*; since whatever the Prophets from the beginning of the World had foretold concerning *Christ*, by the fulfilling of which he should be known, was all exactly accomplish'd in our Lord *Jesus*, and in the material Circumstances of that Alteration which he made in the State of Religion. And in this Sense we find the Phrase used in the Scriptures; particularly by *St. Peter*. *We have also a more sure Word of Prophecy, to which ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a Light that shineth in a dark Place, until the Day dawn, and the Day-star arise in your Hearts.* Where it is evident that *St. Peter* speaks of that Testimony which was given to the *Christian* Religion, by the accomplishment of Prophecies, supposing it to be so clear and strong a Testimony, that it would remove all Doubts, if any remained, concerning the Divine Authority of the Gospel.

The *Light of Prophecy* in the former Sense, is the knowledg of future Contingencies communicated to the Prophets; the *Light of Prophecy* in the latter Sense, is that Testimony which by the accomplishment of their Predictions, is given to others long after, for the Confirmation of their Faith.

Had the Cardinal clearly distinguished between these two Notions, his Reader might easily have seen how far the *Light of Prophecy* may be said to be a Mark by which to know the True Church, *viz.* so far as to do Him and his Cause no manner of Service.

For

For in the latter Sense it may be admitted to be such a Mark; inasmuch as the accomplishment of those Prophecies, which concerned *Christ*, shew'd that *Jesus* was *He*, and that his Doctrine was of God. But then this Light of Prophecy comes no other way to be a Mark of the True Church, than as 'tis an Argument, or if you will call it so, a Mark of that Doctrine, the Profession whereof makes the Church. So that when we have made the best we can of this Note, the Church is still to be known by the Religion it professeth, tho that Religion is known to be Divine, as by other Arguments and Testimonies, so also by the accomplishment of Prophecies.

And yet even here we must be something cautious in laying down the fulfilling of Predictions, as an Argument to prove the Truth of Christianity. For there are some Prophecies both in the Old and New Testament, that in part have been, and will in time be fully accomplished by such Persons whose Doctrine we are by no means to follow. For *Antichrist* was foretold as well as *Christ*; and when he comes and fulfils all that has been said concerning him so long before; the accomplishment of those Predictions is a Mark upon him, not that we should receive, but that we should reject him and his Doctrine. So that 'tis not barely the fulfilling of Prophecies, but of such Prophecies only as described the Characters of that Person whom we were bound to hearken to and to obey in all Things, that is an Argument of True Doctrine. And in this Sense we are not unwilling to admit the *Light of Prophecy* to be a Mark of the True Church, tho it be a very improper way of speaking: Since the Doctrine it self which is demonstrated to be a Divine Doctrine comes to be the proper Note of the Church; and the *Light of Prophecy* is left to

be one of those Arguments by which the Doctrine is demonstrated to be Divine. But this way of *marking* for the Church, is very uncomfortable to the Cardinal's Friends, because it will force them to acknowledg that 'tis not the Church that makes the Religion, but the Religion that makes the Church.

He therefore finding no advantage to his Cause by this Notion of *Prophetick Light*; wholly insists upon the former, and makes the *Gift of foretelling things to come* to be one Note of the Church; and doubts not but to shew it in his own, and will not allow it to be in any other.

So that these two Things must come under Examination.

I. Whether it be a Note of the Church?

II. If it be, Whether he has sufficiently proved that they of the *Roman Church* have it, and no others.

I. Whether it be a Note of the True Church?

The Cardinal offers to prove that it is, by three Arguments huddled up together, which being distinguished, are these.

1. That as *Christ* promised the Gift of Miracles, so he also promised the *Gift of Prophecy* to the Church.

2. That none knows Future Contingencies but God only.

3. That it is a certain Note of False Doctrine, if a Prophet foretells any thing, and it does not come to pass.

Let us now see what all this will amount to.

1. *Christ* promised the Gift of Prophecy to the Church no less than the Gift of Miracles. To which it might be sufficient to say, that as *Miracles*, notwithstanding such a Promise, are no Note of the Church; so neither is

Pro-

Prophecy such a Note, meerly because it was also promised. And there is the same Reason for the one as there is for the other, for neither the one nor the other was promised to last always in the Church. And we have been told sufficiently that the Notes of the Church, according to *Bellarmin* himself, must be Characters that are inseparable from it. Now the place by him produced, is so far from proving that the Gift of Prophecy should flourish in every Age, that there are pregnant Intimations in it of the contrary. He refers us to the Prediction of *Joel* applied by *St. Peter* to the Church. Joel ii. 18.
Acts ii. 16. And because he refers us to it, thither we will go, and not as he does, take Things for granted which ought to be discoursed, but bring forth the Text and see what Argument it will afford. The Apostles, as the Chapter shews, *spake with Tongues* to the amazement of all the Strangers that heard them: But the Unbelieving Jews mocked, and said they were *Drunk*. Upon which *Peter* lightly passing by that absurd Reproach, told them that *this was that which was spoken by the Prophet Joel*. And it shall come to pass in the last Days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all Flesh, and your Sons and your Daughters shall Prophecy, and your young Men shall see Visions, and your old Men, &c. And again, I will pour out in those Days of my Spirit, and they shall Prophecy. Now tho *Prophecy* in the strict Sense signifies foretelling Things to come, yet it is here put for Supernatural Gifts in General, and particularly for speaking Divine Things by Inspiration, and likewise for speaking with new Tongues; which is undeniably evident from hence that the Apostle's speaking of the wonderful Things of God in Tongues they had never learn'd, was by *St. Peter* affirm'd to be foretold in this Prediction of *Joel*. So that the Cardinal ought to have been very much afraid to
make

make what was promised in *Joel* a Note of the Church; for by this means he has made it unavoidably necessary for those of his Communion, the *Young Men*, and the *Old Men*, &c. to speak with Tongues by Inspiration; which is in effect to unchurch his own Party. And therefore I imagin his Followers will not follow him in this, nor advance the Promise in *Joel* into a Note of the Church, but will rather say, that the fulfilling of it in the first Age of the Church was a Testimony to the Truth of Christianity; and that the Prediction of *Joel* was accomplished, tho the same extraordinary Gifts were not continued in every Age afterward.

2. He says, That *none knows Future Contingencies but God only*; which if it should prove that a Church is there, where the *Gift of Prophecy* is, yet it does not prove that there is no Church where that Gift is not, unless it be an inseparable Mark of the Church to have all those future Events made known to one or other in it, which God only knows. Our Saviour said, *of that Day and Hour*, when Himself should come to judge the World, *no Man knoweth, but the Father only*. Does it therefore follow that God must have revealed it to one or other in the Church? If because God only knows Future Contingencies, it follows, that the Church must know them too by Revelation from him; then it follows also that the Church must know all things that are to happen hereafter, because it is God only that can communicate such Knowledg. If he meant that those who have any degree of it must necessarily belong to the Church, because God only can give it; neither is this true, as I shall presently shew: Nor, if it were, could the Gift of foretelling some Things be for this Reason a Note of the Church, unless also the want of this Gift should be a demonstration

stration against any Communion, that it is not a True Church, which I am sure can never be proved from hence that none but God can bestow it.

3. He adds that in *Deut. 18.* it is laid down for a Note of False Doctrine, *If a Prophet foretells any thing, and it does not come to pass.* Now,

First, This Argument is very impertinent, unless as lying Prophecy is said to be a Note of False Doctrine, so False Doctrine be also supposed a Note of a False Church; which is a very dangerous Supposition to a Church, that had rather be tried by any other Note than that of the Truth of her Doctrine: for it seems if we can clearly prove by any Good Argument, that she professeth False Doctrine, it follows without more to do, that she is no True Church. But,

Secondly, It is not said in the place cited by the Cardinal, that False Prophecy is a Note of False Doctrine; but that 'tis a Note, or rather an Argument, that the Prophet had no Commission from God to say that such an Event should come to pass. Nor does it follow from hence that the False Prophet must needs be a *Heretick*, unless it be impossible for a *Catholick* or an *Orthodox* Professor to tell a Lye, which I think no Man will be so hardy as to say.

Thirdly, Much less is it said that a Prophet's foretelling rightly a future contingent Event is a Note of True Doctrine, which had been necessary to make True Prophecy a Note of the True Church. Nay, on the other Hand, there is express Caution given not long before against being seduced into Idolatry by true Predictions. *If there arise among you a Prophet, or a Dreamer of Dreams, and giveth thee a Sign or a Wonder; and the Sign or the Wonder comes to pass whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let us go after other Gods—Thou shalt not*

*Deut. xiii. 1,
2, 3.*

hearken

hearken unto the Words of that Prophet—For the Lord your God proveth you, &c.

Which shews the Confidence of the Cardinal in pronouncing so peremptorily, that there *have been no true Predictions amongst Heathens and Hereticks, unless perhaps for a Testimony to our Faith.* For this Warning plainly supposed that such Predictions there would be, not to confirm Believers in the Truth, but to prove their Constancy under a Temptation to Error. They must indeed be *False Prophets*, as that signifies *False Teachers*, who should endeavour to gain Authority to Impious Doctrines and to Idolatrous Practices, by appealing to the Truth of their own Predictions: But yet they were to be *True Prophets* in respect of the *Events* which they would foretell. And therefore to pretend that Heathens and Hereticks never foretold any Contingency which came to pass, but when Providence designed a farther Testimony to confirm us in the Faith, is, to speak gently, a wretched Mistake: And there is no more Difficulty in this Point, than whether we are to believe God or *Bel-larmin*.

But if there had been no true Prophecies amongst Heathens, besides those which were designed for a Testimony to the *Christian Faith*; yet even these are a manifest Argument that the Gift of Prophecy is no certain Note of the Church, nay they prove it more evidently than any other Prophecies could do; because those Predictions surely have the most unquestionable Truth which were made for a Testimony to True Doctrine. Of which kind that there had been several amongst the *Gentiles*, seems very probable from those Remains thereof which we meet with in *Virgil* and *Tacitus*. Not to insist upon that famous *Acrostic* of *Sybilla Erythraea* in *Lactantius* and *Eusebius*, which it is cer-
tain

tain that *Cicero* had seen ; nor what *Justin Martyr*, and *Apol.* 2.
Clemens Alexandrinus say of the Books of *Hystaspes* ; I *Scrom.* l. 6.
shall only note what *St. Austin* says of this Matter, viz. *Ep.* 49.
That *Christ* was not foretold in *Israel* only, but in other *Qu.* 2.
Nations also ; And that *Predictions* concerning *Christ* may *De Civit. Dei*
be met with in the Books of those who are *Strangers* to *lib.* 18. c. 47.
Israel, and that it is not incongruous to believe that this
Mystery was revealed to *Men* of other *Nations*. Which
Things, saith he, may be mentioned as *Advantages* on our
side over and above what is necessary. Now will any *Man*
say that these *Predictions* did less shew a *Prophetic*
Light amongst the *Gentiles*, because they were true ?
With what *Conscience* therefore could *Bellarmin* shuffle
off those famous *Predictions* of *Balaam* a *Heathen Sooth-* *Numb.* xxiv.
fayer, concerning *Christ*, (to which he adds those of the *15. &c.*
Sybills) by saying that they were a *Testimony* to our
Faith ? As if the *Argument* were not so much the
stronger, that the *Gift* of *True Prophecy* is not confined
within the *Communion* of the *Church*. Surely he
could not be ignorant that the *Old Testament* it self is
called *the Word of Prophecy*, and that the main *Predi-* *2 Pet. i. 19.*
ctions thereof were for a *Testimony* to confirm us in
the *Faith*. But by the same reason that he strikes off
the true *Predictions* of *Heathens* from being an *Instance*
of *Prophetic Light*, because forsooth they were for the
Confirmation of our *Faith* ; he must also set aside the
best *Evidence* of *Prophetic Light* within the *Communi-*
on of the *Church* ; the *Predictions* whereof were no
less, but more than any others for a *Testimony* to our
Faith.

As to the *Oracles* of *Apollo* which he does well to re-
ject from being *True Prophecies*, we need not to offer
them for the disparagement of this *Note* of *Prophetic*
Light ; since they might be deceitful, and yet the *Light*

of Prophecy neither be always in the Church, nor never amongst those that are out of it.

But when he tells us, *That Hereticks are deceived as often as they would foretell any thing*, and that *this appears from the False Prophets in the Old Testament*; it is a pitiful thing that such a Man should think it enough to prove a Conclusion so general by a particular Instance. He refers us to *1 Kings 22.* where we find that *Ahab's* Prophets spake by a Lying Spirit. But does this prove that Hereticks *never* prophecy truly? There were some False Prophets amongst the Ten Tribes upon their Revolt, therefore there never were any True Ones. How came it then to pass that there were so many of the Lord's Prophets amongst them, that at one time *Obadiah* hid an hundred of them? There were some False Prophets amongst the *Jews*; were all the *Jewish* Prophets therefore deceived, when they pretended to foretell any thing? We find that God charged the Prophets of *Hierusalem*, no less than those of *Samaria*, with Imposture; with *running before they were sent*, and *propheying when God had not spoken to them*, and with *propheying Lies in his Name*, and a great deal more to this purpose. Therefore, by the Cardinal's *Logick*, it appears by *the False Prophets in the Old Testament*, that *Catholicks are deceived as often as they would foretell any thing.*

1 King. xviii. 4.

Jerem. xxiii.

14, 21, 25, &c.

To conclude this Matter, since the Cardinal seemed to take a particular delight in proving his Notes of the Church out of the Old Testament; I shall leave this one Argument out of the Old Testament, against his present Note of *Prophetick Light*. To make it a Note of the Church it is necessary that there should have been no True Prophecy but in the Church, which is notoriously False, because *Balaam* who was but a Heathen Diviner, proph-

propheſied truly of *Chriſt*. It is neceſſary alſo that this Gift ſhould always have continued in the Church, which is alike Falſe; becauſe there was no Prophet amongſt the *Jews* between *Malachi*, and *Zachary* the Father of *John the Baptiſt*, that is for about 400 Years together.

And thus much concerning the firſt Inquiry, *Whether Prophetick Light be a Note of the Church*. I come now to the Second.

II. *If it be ſuch a Note, Whether the Cardinal hath ſufficiently proved that they of the Roman Church have it, and no others?*

He pretends to prove that there have been Prophets in the *Catholick Church*, which no Body denies. But you muſt know that the *Catholick Church* is a Term of Art, which theſe Maſters to the Abufe of Names and Words, as well as of Things and Perſons, are reſolved ſhall ſignify the *Roman Church*. Weil; let the *Roman Church* be their *Catholick Church*; with *us* 'tis but the *Roman*: And now that we underſtand one another, How does he prove that there have been Prophets amongſt them? Why, he produces the Prophets of the Old Teſtament, and thoſe that propheſied for 500 Years after Chriſt; *Agabus* for Inſtance, who is mentioned in the *Acts*, chap. 11, &c. Now by this I perceive that it was warily done of the Cardinal, and not in courſe to call his Church the *Catholick Church*; for if he had produced the Prophets of the Old Teſtament, and *Agabus* with the Prophets of the New, to prove that the *Roman Church* has had Prophets, it had look'd ſo ſimply, that the Cardinal himſelf could not have born it. But this is one of their old Fetches, that when they would get any Credit

by the Prophets and the Apostles, they call themselves *the Catholick Church*; and then because the Prophets and Apostles belonged to the Catholick Church, they must belong to them, and to no Christians of any Communion but theirs. But how I pray comes it to pass that we have less Interest in the Prophets, the Apostles, and the Primitive *Christians*, than the *Roman Church* has, nay that we have none, and they have all? One thing I am sure of, that if our Doctrines and theirs be severally compared with the Writings of those Renowned Antients, it will not be hard to say who are their Children, they or we, and that they are *our* Predecessors and Parents, and not *theirs* in all those Points wherein we differ from them. And therefore since 'tis in behalf of those particulars wherein we have left the Church of *Rome*, that the *Prophetic Light* of the Old and New Testament is produced as an Argument that the *Roman Church* has had Prophets; we have some reason to think that the Cardinal by producing the Prophets of both Testaments in this Cause, has given us a terrible Weapon against himself, and by their *Prophetick Light* discovered, that if the *Roman Church* and ours, cannot be parts of the same Church, then we who have the Prophets and Apostles with us in the Doctrine we maintain, are a True Church exclusively to them, and not they to us.

In the next place we are told of *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, and *Anthony*, and *John the Anchoret*, whose Predictions are related by *St. Basil*, *Athanasius* and *Austin*. Now *Gregory* was Bishop of *Cæsarea*, *Anthony* an *Egyptian Monk*, and *John* an *Anchoret* in a certain Wilderness of *Egypt*. But how all this proves that there have been Prophets in the *Roman Church*, is never to be made out otherwise than by supposing the *Greek* and the *Egyptian Churches* to signify the *Roman Church*, by the same

Figure

Figure that the *Catholick Church*, and that of *Rome* are all one.

The exprefs Testimonies he brings are concerning *St. Benediſt*, *St. Bernard*, and *St. Francis*. *St. Benediſt* told *Totila* that he ſhould reign nine Years, and dye the Tenth, which as *Gregory* ſaith happened accordingly. *St. Bernard* foretold the Conversion of four unlikely Perſons: And which was *very admirable*, as *Bellarmin* affirms, when he was deſired to pray for the Conversion of a certain Nobleman; *Fear not*, ſays he, *I ſhall bury him a perfect Monk in this very place of Claravall*. Upon which the Cardinal cries out, *How many Prophecies are there in this one Sentence? For that he ſhould one Day be a Monk, and perſevere therein to the Death, and end his Days in a holy ſort, and that before St. Bernard's Death, and this in Claravall, and that he ſhould be buried by St. Bernard's own Hands; are ſix diſtinct Prophecies, and all of them not without God's ſingular Providence fulfilled*. As for *St. Francis*, He admoniſhed the Generals of the *Chriſtian Army*, not to fight upon ſuch a Day with the *Saracens*, for *God had revealed to him that upon that Day they would be beaten*. But *they contemning the Admonition of Bleſſed Francis*, fought, and were overthrown with a miſerable Slaughter. And *many more things of the ſame kind*, the Cardinal aſſures us, *might be added*. And if he had none of a better kind than theſe, he ought to have produced his *many more*, and at leaſt given us Number for Weight.

Now tho I could very willingly give him all his three Stories, yet I am loth to be thought ſo ſilly, as to take every thing of this kind for Goſpel, which we are told by *Bonaventure*, that wrote the Life of *St. Francis*, or by *Gofrid* that wrote that part of *St. Bernard's* Life, where the Cardinal finds him a Prophet, no nor by
Gregory

Dial. lib. 2.
cap. 2. 4.

Gregory himself, in the second Book of his *Dialogues*, concerning the Life and Miracles of *Benedict* the Abbot. The Story of the Blackbird that went off with the Sign of the Cross, and that other of the little Black-Boy invisible to all till *Benedict* saw him, that drew away the idle Monk from his Prayers; with many more such rank Fables as these are, do plainly shew that Pope *Gregory* had Credulity enough to have lived in the Age of *Gosfrid*, or in that which next followed of *Bonaventure*, who is never to be forgotten for his Devotion to the Virgin.

But allowing these Stories to be well attested, let us see how the Cardinal proves by them that the Church of *Rome* has the Gift of Prophecy. Why he tells us that these Monasticks were *addicted to the Pope*. Now how much *Benedict* was *addicted to the Pope* is not worth Enquiry; since his Prophetick Gift will do the Church of *Rome* no Service now that she is so vastly altered from what she was in Pope *Gregory's* Days, who wrote the Abbot's Life, as has lately been proved beyond possibility of Confutation. As for St. *Bernard*, he was certainly very far from being addicted to the Pope, who besides his sharp Reproofs of *Eugenius*, told him in plain Terms, that he was *not a Lord of the Bishops, but one of them*. So that if his Prophecies too must go for the Credit of that Communion that agrees most with him in Doctrine, we shall put hard to get the Prophet on our side, by shewing that there was good reason to put him into the *Catalogus Testium Veritatis*. But for St. *Francis* we are very willing to let the Church of *Rome* take him, and his Prophecy, and to make the best of it they can. It is so very trifling a Business; that the Cardinal's making use of such Stories to support so magnificent a Pre-
tence, as that of *Prophetick Light* in his Church, plainly
shews

Vindication of
Answer to some
late Papers. p.
72.
De Consider.
ad Eugen. l. 3.

shews that either he was, or ought at least to have been troubled that he had no better.

He should have remembered the just Exceptions he brought against the Heathen Oracles; and since he appealed to the Old Testament for this his Note of the Church, he had done well to consider the vast difference between the Predictions of the Prophets there on the one side, and not only between those Oracles, but these his petty Predictions also on the other. And then certainly he would have been ashamed of these Proofs of a *Gift of Prophecy* amongst those of his own Party which he brings when he would apply this Note to his Church.

I grant that the Predictions of the Holy Scriptures are not all of a size, and tho all the Prophets spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, yet some of their Predictions had incomparably more clear and unquestionable Characters of Divinity upon them than others had. And those were the Predictions designed to give Testimony to our Faith, of which kind those of the Old Testament made it to be *the Word of Prophecy*. For there we find that divers matters of Fact were foretold many Ages, and some of them thousands of Years before the Event: that the time when such and such things should happen is described by the Fall of Empires, not then begun when the Prophet spake, nor to begin for some hundreds of Years after; that such Circumstances were at so vast a distance of time foretold, that it was impossible for any created Understanding so much as to guess at them so long before they came to pass; in a word that the several Things which the Prophets at sundry times foretold concerning *Christ*, met in *Jesus*, and conspired in bearing witness to him; the Evidence of that Testimony being unanswerable when all things were laid together:

gether : For this was the method our Saviour took to confirm his two doubting Disciples, *He began at Moses and A L L the Prophets, and expounded to them in A L L the Scriptures, the things concerning himself.*

Luke xxiv. 27.

1 Kings xiii. 2.

2 Kings xxiii.

16.

Isa. xlv. 28.

xlv. 4.

Ezra i. 1.

Not that there were no illustrious Predictions before *Christ* but such as were to be fulfilled in him ; for many there were that received their Accomplishment before : Such as that of the Birth of *Josias* by Name, three hundred Years before he was born, and his burning upon the Altar at *Bethel* the Priests Bones that had offered Incense there. And that of restoring the Jews by *Cyrus the Persian*, tho neither he nor the *Persian* Empire was yet in being, no nor the Captivity begun from which he was to release them. The fulfilling of such Predictions as these, was a sort of Testimony to the Truth of the Prophecies concerning *Christ*, till the time came when the answerableness of the Event should above all things shew that they also were Divine.

If a Man would make the Gift of Prophecy a Note of the Church, and then apply it to his own, one would expect that he should bring forth some such Predictions as those of the Scriptures which are beyond all Exception Divine, for the carrying on of his purpose. But instead of that, to bring two or three thin Stories, one of which is a Prediction of an Event that was to happen the same Day, is to expose a Man's Cause to the contempt of a Heathen if he were here, who could out of good Authorities produce more notable Predictions of *Sooth-sayers*, *Augurs*, and *Ragan Priests*, that came to pass. 'Tis a shame to see what pains the Cardinal took to split *St. Bernard's* Prediction concerning the Nobleman's turning Monk, into *six several Prophecies*, after honest *Gofrid* could find but *two* there. If this were a place to make Sport, it would be

be no unpleasant work to be a little severe in casting up the Account again. But certainly if a Heathen were to read this Twelfth Note of the Cardinal, and there find the *Gift of Prophecy* made a mark of the Society that is united by True Religion, as he would guess *the Church* means, he would be apt to think that Christians could produce no better Prophecies than these of *Bellarmin's* collecting, to prove there has been a *Prophetic Light* in the Church ; which if it were true of the Catholick Church in all Ages, would be no little disparagement to it ; and being true of the *Roman Church*, is no less a disparagement to that, if the Gift of Prophecy be a *Note* : For if the Cardinal had better, why did he not produce them ?

I do not by any means deny that some Predictions may be truly Divine, which yet are far from having the unquestionable Characters of Divinity upon them. One Man may by his skill in those Affairs foresee the loss of a Battel which no Man but himself comprehends the reason of. Another may boldly and at all adventure foretell it without reason, and pretend a Revelation for it. And yet *Micaiah* in the case of *Ahab* foretold such a thing by Divine Revelation. But then they are not such Predictions as these, that will of themselves serve a Man's turn to prove the Gift of Prophecy to be in his Communion. In conjunction with others that are unquestionably Divine, they may be brought into the Argument, but not alone ; because it is so very difficult to distinguish them from Predictions that are not Divine, when they are abstracted from other Considerations.

I am also as willing to grant that since the unquestionably Divine Predictions of the Old and New Testament, when God poured out the Spirit of Prophecy upon his Servants, there have been now and then in the Church some sprinklings of it, and that several Persons have foretold Things by Divine Revelation, which had no Evidence of it comparable to what the great strokes of Scripture-Prophecy have. Such a Prediction I would allow that of *Benedict* to be which the Cardinal cites, if one had good reason to believe it. And I would not much quarrel with that which *Gosfrid* tells of *St. Bernard*, though I have no great Opinion of it. But for *St. Francis* I desire to be wholly excused. Which I do not say as if there were any danger of granting that there has been something of this lower degree of Prophecy amongst some in the *Roman* Communion: for if *Prophetick Light* were a Note of the Church, 'tis not the foretelling of a few Events that happen not long after the Prediction, which will amount to it, tho there may be more reason, upon the account of the Holiness of the Person, or some such other Consideration, to ascribe it to a Divine Revelation, than to any other Cause. As there are some Divine Miracles that have the *Finger of God*, while others are hard to be distinguished from Delusions and Lying Wonders; So some Divine Predictions there are which have the Characters of God's Omniscience upon them, while others are capable of being resolved into other Causes: But he must be at a great loss for Church-Marks, that would mark his Church by Prophetick Light without the former.

As for the latter, I have said once already, and I say it again, that they may, nay I am apt to think that they have had some such in the *Roman* Communion. But the Cardinal is very unlucky in his Instances, as some others of that Church are whom I have consulted. I cannot see why such a-doe should be made about the Predictions of *Philippus Nerus* the *Florentine*, that care must be taken to preserve the Attestations of them. When he could not persuade a *Jew* to pray to *Christ* for himself, he desired the Standers-by to pray for him, promising them that he would be converted; which came to pass, as we are told, in a few Days. Again, when one of his Converts had lent a sum of Money to a Banker, he made him go and fetch it back before Night, tho he knew not the Man; and within a few Days the Banker broke. Sometimes he foretold that such a Sick Man would dye, and sometimes that such an one would recover. Which Predictions are as modest as may be; but no other reason can be given, I think, why *Nerus* must for such Things as these pass for a Prophet, but that they cannot write the Lives of their Saints, without stuffing them as with Miracles, and Visions, and Extasies, so sometimes with Prophecies too, and then they must be content with such as can be had. The Good Writer of *St. Rose's* Life took great pains to make her a Prophetess not long before her Death: For she, forsooth, knew by Divine Inspiration that a Convent of *St. Catherine* of *Siena* would be built, and this, ten Years before the Foundation was laid; she had it shewn sometimes by Signs and Figures, sometimes in the exact Fashion and Model, and would talk of it as if she had

Vita Phil. Ner.
p. 76. Mog.

P. 100.

S. Rose Vita
c. 18.

it before her Eyes; she drew it out upon a Paper, and she could tell who would be the first Abbess there, knew her by Face, and after a sort consecrated her by a Kiss, insomuch that some thought she was mad.

It is as hard to believe that the Spirit of Prophecy should be given to a Maid, for no other end as it should seem by this Story, but to get her the Fame of a Prophetess, as that the Ludicrous Miracles, that do no manner of Good, are the Marks of Divine Power.

It may be reasonable to believe that some measure of this Gift is imparted, when not only the Event answers the Prediction, but when the End aimed at is Great and Good, and of General Use, as when God sent Prophets to his People *to bring them back to the Law*. I should therefore make no Difficulty to allow that *Hieronymus Savonarola* a very Religious Friar in *Florence*, was sometimes enlightened with Prophetick Knowledg, because he did not only foretell several Things that happened, some in his Life-time, some after his Death, and others that are yet to come to pass; but his Business was plainly this, to awaken Men to Repentance, and to forewarn the Great Ones themselves of the Judgments of God hanging over them, if they would not do their parts to restore good Discipline and good Manners to the Church. Thus, as *Philip de Comminees* tells us, he assured *Charles the VIII* that he should be very prosperous in his Voyage into *Italy*, and this that he might reform the corrupt State of the Church, which if he should neglect to do,

do, he should return with Dishonour, and God would reserve that Work for another; and so it happened. He was a Man of singular Vertue and Piety, and obtain'd the Reputation of a Prophet, not only with † the greatest part of the People, but with such Men as *Philip de Comminees*, who knew him well; and that Noble Earl *Jo. Franciscus Pius*, who wrote his Life. To which we may add that he was served as God's Prophets sometimes have been, being put to Death at the Instigation of the Pope. And for what reason do we think? but because he prophesied against the Simony, Whoredoms, and Prophaneness that reigned in the Church; for which he was accus'd of Preaching scandalously against the Manners of the Clergy and Court of *Rome*. In short, he was silenced by Pope *Alexander* the VIth, and at length upon the Pope's Process against him, he with two of his Companions were tormented, and all to make him deny that he had received those things from God which he had said, and after horrible Tortures, which he endured with great Patience, he and they were at once hanged and burned; to the everlasting Infamy of some-body, and no less to their Confusion, who will needs have it believed that there have been Prophets in the *Roman* Communion.

† Guicciard.
Hist. lib. ii.
p. 42.

Lib.iii. p. 94

Vita Savonar.

Savonarola was put to Death in the Year 1498, a little before the Reformation. It was about an 150 Years before that, that *Joannes de Rupe Scissa*, such an other Man as *Savonarola*, and a Monk, prophesied to the same purpose that he did after him, foretelling several Things that happened afterwards

Froffard.
Chron. Tom. I,
2.

terwards in the Kingdom of *France*; but running out into the Reproof of the Luxury and Vices of the Pope and the Great Church-men, Pope *Innocent* laid hold on him, and kept him in Prison, as *Froffard* acquaints us, who relates these Things at large. If there were room for it, I believe some more Instances of this kind might be added, to shew that which *Bellarmin* has aimed at, but failed of doing, *viz.* That they have had in their Communion some Persons who cannot reasonably be denied to have had the Revelation of *some* Future Events. But let the Instance of *Savonarola* be by no means forgotten, for 'tis the clearest of any that I ever yet met with for that purpose, and which is something more, his Story stands upon better Authorities by far than that of *Gofrid*, or that of *Bonaventure*. And thus having found out Prophets for them, let the Cardinal's Followers make the best on't.

For what remains; the Cardinal's proof that *Luther* had nothing of the Gift of Prophecy is very insufficient, allowing *Cochleus's* Story, that *Luther* said the *Pope* and *Cardinals*, &c. would all vanish if himself should go on to preach two Years longer. It does by no means appear that he spake this with a pretence to the Spirit of Prophecy, but it is rather evident that he did not, since his belief of this Success was grounded upon the Supposition of his preaching so much longer. Nor was it very much to be admired, if a Man of his fervent Spirit, who had in so little time drawn off such Multitudes from their dependence upon the *Roman* See, should promise himself in so good a Cause that the Papacy would in a short time be

be generally forsaken. The Event indeed was not answerable to his Assurance, and this shewed that he was mistaken in his Opinion; but there was nothing of the False Prophet in the Case.

Melancton, who may be believed concerning *Luther*, *Vita Lutheri* as well as *Bonaventure* concerning *St. Francis*, tells us ^{a Mel.} of several Things that *Luther* foretold; others say the same for *Melancton*. The Prediction of *John Hufs*, that an hundred years after, they that burned him should have to do with a *Swan* that would find them work; and the Event proving accordingly, is known by All. These are Things we think fit to observe: but we are of a Church that does not put us upon that hard Service, as to make a Note out of them. For that Church that has the True Notes, does not need any False Ones.

T H E E N D.

L O N D O N,

Printed by J. D. for *Richard Chiswell* at the Rose and Crown in *St. Paul's Church-Yard*, 1687.

The Thirteenth Note of the CHURCH EXAMINED,

VIZ,

The Confession of Adversaries.

Decima tertia Nota est Confessio Adversariorum. Bellarm. L. iv.
c. 15. de Notis Ecclesiæ.

I M P R I M A T U R.

July 18. 1687.

Guil. Needham.

THE Substance of what the Cardinal contends for in this Chapter amounts to no more than this, That the force of Truth is so great that the Enemies of it are constrained to bear witness to it. And whereas Catholicks (by which he means the Christians of the Roman Communion) neither praise nor approve either the Doctrine, or Life of Heathens or Hereticks, but affirm them all to err, who follow not their Doctrine; yet *Pagans* and *Jews*, *Turks* and *Hereticks* speak well of them. This he accounts an Argument that they are in the right, the *Confession of Enemies* being very considerable in this Case. And that their Enemies do bear this Testimony, he attempts to prove by an induction of Particulars from the Writings

of *Pagans, Jews, &c.* which shall be considered in due place. For the clearing of this whole matter I shall do these things:

I. Enquire whether this *Confession of Enemies* be indeed a Note of the Church, or not.

II. If that should be granted, the next Enquiry will be, Whether or not the Particulars produced by the Cardinal do evince that this Note is peculiar to the Roman Church exclusively to other Christians that are not of her Communion.

III. I shall examine the Question a little further, and more especially the Testimony of the *Jews*.

I. Enquire whether this *Confession of Enemies* be indeed a Note of the Church, or not.

Cap. 2. If it be no *Note*, the Cardinal might have spared the pains of this Chapter. And that it is none, I make no doubt to make appear beyond all exception: And here I appeal to the Cardinal himself; nor shall I need any other Argument to prove it to be none than what I borrow from him. He hath told us what things are required to constitute Notes of the Church; and I am well content in this matter to be concluded by him. He tells us, amongst other things, that *true Notes are inseparable from the true Church*. In this we are agreed, and shall easily allow this *Confession of Adversaries* to be a true Note, if it be inseparable from the true Church. But if the true Church may be without it, it can be no true Note of it. For that can never bring me to the certain knowledge of a thing which may or may not belong to it, and is so far from being essential to it, that the thing may not only be without it, but must be before this can belong to it, and will continue to be
tho

tho this should not be at all. This is plainly the Case: The Church of *Rome* must be the true Church (as the Cardinal pretends) because *Jews, Pagans and Turks, &c.* bear witness to her. But this Confession of her Adversaries is essential, and an inseparable Mark of this Church, or it is not. If it be not, it can be no true Note. And if it be, then the true Church cannot be without it, and we could not have known it to be a true Church, if it had not happened that *Jews and Pagans, &c.* had born their Testimony to her; so that upon the matter the Church is much beholden to her Enemies for this Note; for had not they chanced to have spoken well of her, this Note had been quite lost; and yet 'tis absurd to suppose she could be without a Note, which is, according to the Cardinal, something that is inseparable. Certainly the True Church must be before she had any Enemies, and might have continued a True Church, if these Enemies had not spoken well of her at all, and therefore it is very absurd to make this Confession of her Adversaries an inseparable Note that she is a True Church when if she ever were a True Church she must be so before these Adversaries did testify of her.

There was a Time, in the Infancy of the Christian Church, when the Church was *every where spoken against*, and when the whole Christian Religion was by its Adversaries called *Heresy*: A Time there was before the Adversaries of the Church, Pagans and Hereticks; &c. had made this Confession. The Church at that time was no true Church, or else this *Confession of Adversaries* is no inseparable Note of it. Either there was no true Church in that Primitive Time, or else this Confession of Enemies must be discharged from being a Note.

Act. 23. 22.

with Chap. 24.

5. 14.

The Thirteenth Note of the Church,

But this Confession is a *Note* of the Cardinal's making. *Jesus Christ* the Head of the Church, never made it one. So far was he from making this a *Note* of the true Church, that he rather makes it a *Sign* of the contrary. *Wou unto you* (says he) *when all Men shall speak well of you ; for so did their Fathers to the false Prophets.* Our Lord calls them *Blessed* (and certainly he speaks not of them that were out of the true Church) that are *reviled* and have all *manner of Evil* said against them. He pronounceth them *Blessed* who are *reproached*, and whose *Name* is *cast out as Evil* ; he bids them *rejoyce in that day and be exceeding glad.* St. *Peter* reckons the *Reproaches for the Name of Christ a Glory and Happiness.* And *Simcon* foretold of *Jesus*, that he was set for a *Sign which shall be spoken against.* And we preach *Christ crucified, unto the Jews a Stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks Foolishness,* says the great Apostle of the Gentiles.

So far is this *Confession of Adversaries* from being a *Note* of a true Church, as the Cardinal would make it, that the *Reproaches and Scoffs of Enemies* is no *Reflection* upon the true Church of *Christ.* The worst of Men do not use to treat the best things well ; and when these bad Men are *Enemies* they do no *Prejudice* with wise Men by their *Invectives and Reproaches.* *Tertullian* concludes the *Christian Religion* good, because *Nero*, one of the worst of Men, bent his Force against it. The Church will want nothing that is required though *Jews and Pagans* should with one *Consent* perpetually declaim against her.

In a word, this *Confession of Adversaries*, of what use soever it may be, can be no *Note* ; for it is contingent and arbitrary, and lies at the pleasure of those who are not only out of the Church, but *Enemies* to it ; and in
the

Qui enim scit
illum, intelli-
gere potest
non nisi ali-
quid bonum
grande à Ne-
rone damna-
tum. Tertull.
Apol.

the Infancy of Christianity the Church was without this Note; and if that be allowed to be a true Church, this can be no true Note of it.

II. But if it should be granted that this is a true Note, the next Enquiry will be, whether or not the Particulars produced by the Cardinal do evince that this Note is peculiar to the Roman Church *exclusively* to other Christians that are not of her Communion?

'Tis certain that by the true Church (the Notes whereof the Cardinal attempts to give us) he means only the Church of *Rome*. And what in the Beginning of his Book he calls the *true Church*, he calls afterwards *our Church*, and makes them both one and the same: At last it comes to *our Catholick Church* with him.

So that this Note of his which he calls the *Confession of Enemies*, must belong peculiarly to the *Roman Church*, or else 'twill do him no Service. For this is a Rule which the Cardinal hath laid down, that *Notes must be proper and not common*. ^{C. II.} For (says he) if I would describe a certain Man to one who knows him not, I must not say he is one that hath two Eyes and Hands, &c. because these are common things, and he will never find him by such common Descriptions as these. According to this Account we may justly expect that when the Cardinal produceth the *Confession* of Adversaries in behalf of the Church, he should produce Witnesses who speak of that very Church of which he makes this Confession a Note; else these Witnesses prove nothing to his purpose. If they should chance only to speak some favourable words of Christianity, or of some few Christians, this will be short of what they are produced for in this Place. And what ever good use may be made of their Confession, yet

The Thirteenth Note of the Church,

yet 'twill not belong peculiarly to the Church of *Rome*. They must speak to the Church of *Rome*, and in her behalf, or else the Cardinal had better have spared them: They'l do him no service, if they do not make good his *Note*; and that cannot be done if they witness not in behalf of the Roman Church. 'Tis time now to call the Witnesses, and hear what they have to say in behalf of the Church of *Rome*.

And here, not to invert that Order which the Cardinal hath taken, we will begin with the *Pagans*, and see what they have to say in behalf of the Church of *Rome*. The Cardinal begins with *Pliny* the Second: He in his Epistle to the Emperor *Trajan* gives this Testimony in behalf of *Christians*, viz. that *they detested all Vices, lived most holily, and were blamable on this account only, that they were too forward to part with their Lives for their God; and they rose up before day to sing praises to Christ*. But what is all this to the Church of *Rome*, especially as it is now constituted, and distinguished from other *Christians* which are not of her Communion, and do not own themselves subject to the Bishop of that Church? He speaks well of *Christians*, and we allow that those of the Church of *Rome* at that time were such: We have no quarrel with the *Christians* of the Roman Church who lived in the days of *Trajan*. *Pliny* speaks well of them; He does so indeed: But what does he say? Does he say that they worshipped Images, or that they adored the Host? That they prayed to Saints, and made use of several Intercessors? That they deserved Favour, because they came so near the *Pagans* in these things? He says no such thing. He tells us that they lived well, and detested Vices; that they sang praises to *Jesus*, and were willing to die for God. Did we ever find fault with any of the
Church

Church of *Rome* for their good Lives, or the Hymns of Praise which they sing to Christ? Have we ever quarrelled with them for detesting Vices, or exposing their Lives for the Honour of the true God? He commends the Christians that lived then, but not for any thing which they either believed or practised, which is now a matter of Controversy between us and the present Church of *Rome*. *Pliny* commends the ancient Christians: Be it so: Why must this be restrained to the Church of *Rome*? Were there no Christians but what were in Communion with, and were subject to the *Roman* Church? He commends the Christians of that Time: But will this justify them who afterwards shall call themselves by that Name? He commends them for their good Lives, their Love to God, and Gratitude to their Saviour: Will this justify the present Church of *Rome*? Will it serve to defend the Worship of Images, or Prayers to the Blessed Virgin, and Invocation of Saints? Does it appear that there were no Christians in the World but those of the Church of *Rome*, and that that Church was then what it is now?

What the Cardinal produceth afterwards, hath no greater Force than this Testimony of *Pliny*. *Tertullian* tells us that the *Heathens* would not hear the Cause of *Christians*, whom they knew to be guiltless, but condemned it at all Adventures; and that the best Emperors favoured Christianity, and that 'twas persecuted by the worst. All this, however it may serve the common Christianity, does not make for the purpose for which the Cardinal does produce it.

The same may be said as to what he mentions of the Efficacy of the Prayers of the Christian Souldiers from the Epistle of *M. Aurelius*; and if *St. Antony*, *St. Hilariion*, and *St. Martin* were revered by the *Pagans*;

I do not so much as imagine what Service this will be to the Cause the Cardinal hath undertaken to defend, or what Prejudice 'twill be to ours. So that hitherto here is nothing said to the purpose in hand, nothing said but what the Protestants may as well apply to themselves as the Church of *Rome*.

His next Set of Witnesses are *Jews*; if we examine them we shall only find that he hath wisely made choice of two great Names, but that neither of them speak one Word to the purpose: His Authors are *Josephus* the Historian, and *Philo Judæus*, two incomparable Authors they are, and by no means to be excepted against. Here's the Mischief, that neither of them have a Syllable that makes for the Defence of the Church of *Rome*, or the Prejudice of the Reformed. However let us hear them speak: And first let us hear what *Josephus*, the elder of the two, hath to say: It is this, that *Jesus* was a wise Man, if it be lawful to call him a Man; that he was the Effector of wondrous Works, &c. and that he was the Christ or Messias. By the way the Cardinal makes *Josephus* speak Non-sense, as he reports his Testimony: For he says, not only that *Josephus* does affirm Christ to be more than a Man, but that he was truly the Messias: Now *Josephus* would never speak at this rate; to affirm that Christ is the Messias, is to affirm that Christ is Christ, for the Messias and Christ are the same. *Josephus* affirms that *Jesus* lived at that time which he mentions, and that *Jesus* was the Christ or Messias. But to let this pass; I grant that *Josephus* affirms that *Jesus* was the Christ; what is this to the Church of *Rome* any farther than it concerns our common Christianity? I would fain know why the Cardinal produceth this in behalf of his Church, or what reason can be assigned why Protestants may not

Joseph. Antiq.
Jud. l. 18. c. 6.

not as well apply it to their own. The common Christianity is concerned in such a Testimony, and so far the *Roman Church* is also. But set aside that Consideration, and take the Church of *Rome* as the Cardinal does, as distinct from, and opposed to other *Christians* that are not of her Communion, and I dare say I will produce Testimonies as pertinent as this of *Josephus* out of any Page of *Homer's Iliads*, or the *Commentaries* of *Julius Cæsar*. For what Coherence is there between these two Propositions, *Josephus confesseth that Jesus was the Christ, Therefore the Church of Rome is the Catholick Church?* And yet this is in truth the Cardinal's way of arguing.

Let us hear next what *Philo Judæus* hath to say in behalf of the Christians of the Church of *Rome*. Now it would be to me a wonderful thing to find *Philo* say any thing in behalf of those Christians, when he never once mentions the Name of Christian in all his Works. Yet the Cardinal hath the Confidence to affirm that *Philo* hath written a famous Book of the Praises of those Christians who lived in *Egypt* under *St. Mark* the Evangelist. After this his positive Affirmation that *Philo* had written such a Book, as being sensible that *Philo* hath no Book that bears any such Title, he adds the Testimony of some of the Ancients, that *Philo* meant the *Christians*, and not any Sect of the *Jews*, as the *Centuriators* would have. I do not think it worth my while to examin his Antient Writers which he quotes for his Opinion: I will for once take it for granted that *Philo* means the Christians of whom he gives so good a Character, under the Title of *Therapeutæ*.

*Philo Judæ de
vicâ Contem-
plativâ.*

Let it be so, What is this to the Business? Because those Christians in *Egypt* were good Men, and such as

Philo describes them, must therefore the Church of *Rome* be the Catholick Church?

The next Witnesses which the Cardinal produceth are *Turks*; He tells us that in the *Alcoran* 'tis said that *Christians* are saved, that *Christ* was the greatest of Prophets, and had the Soul of God; and that the Sultan of *Egypt* revered St. *Francis* whom he knew to be a *Christian* and a *Catholick*. To what purpose all this is produced I do not understand: I am sure it cannot serve that of the Church of *Rome* as she stands separated from other *Christians*. And if it be a Testimony in behalf of our common Christianity, then all *Christians* are concerned in it as well as that of the Church of *Rome*. The *Alcoran* will do the Cardinal no Service, unless he could have produced some Testimony peculiar to the *Roman* Church, or that might have justified the Worship of Images, Adoration of the Host, the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, or some of those Doctrines and Practices peculiar to that Church.

The last Set of Witnesses produced by the Cardinal he calls *Hereticks*. A Man would think the case very desperate that needs such Witnesses. But yet I find the Church of *Rome* does not disdain such as these, when they speak of her side. But in the present Question we shall find they do that Church no Service: The Substance of what the Cardinal alledgeth is what follows, *viz.* That an *Arian* King honoured St. *Benedict* a *Catholick*; That *Luther*, when an *Heretick*, owned that in the Papacy were many good Things, nay all that was good, *e.g.* The true Scripture, *Baptism*, &c. That *Calvin* calls *Bernard* a pious Writer, and yet he was a *Papist*. That another *Protestant* acknowledgeth *Bernard*, *Dominic*, and *Francis* to be Holy Men; To which he adds a Passage of *Cochleus*, who reports an Article of Agreement wherein

wherein the *Protestant Helvetians* write that they would dismiss their Confederates Quiet, as to their true, undoubted, and their Catholick Faith.

From all which I see not what he can collect for the Interest of the Church of *Rome*. We do honour every Man that is good in the Church of *Rome*, but this does not infer that we justify all her Doctrines. We own that they have the true Scripture and Sacraments, but this does not justify their addition of Apocryphal Books to the Canon of the Scriptures, nor of more Sacraments than were owned to be strictly so in the Antient Church. We will allow that there have been pious and holy Men, of that Church, and are not scrupulous in calling them by the Name by which they are commonly known and distinguished from others. Much good may do them with such Witnesses as *Calvin* and *Luther*, who did to the last bear Testimony against the Corruptions and Innovations of that Church.

III. I shall examin the Question a little farther, and more especially the Testimony of the *Jews*.

I might make many Remarks upon what the Cardinal affirms, that whereas *Catholicks* neither praise nor approve the Doctrine or Life of *Heathens* or *Hereticks*, yet these speak well of them. I do not think the *Romanists* the more *Catholick* for this, that they speak well of none but of themselves, and will allow Salvation to none but those of her own Communion. I could name a certain Lord of this Kingdom, who was upon his Death-Bed urged to declare himself of the Church of *Rome*, from this Argument of *Bellarmin*, viz. That they of the Church of *Rome* denounced Damnation to all out of her Communion; whereas we *Protestants* allowed Salvation as possible to some of them. But he

Joh. 13. 35.

answered the Priest that urged this, That *he thought it safest to dye in the Communion of that Church that was most Charitable.* A Man would think that *Charity*, which is an inseparable Note of a *Christian*, and made so by our Blessed Saviour, might have been allowed to have been a Mark of the true Church also.

That they do not commend *Heathens* the Cardinal affirms roundly, and yet 'twere no hard matter to prove that many *Catholicks* have done it, and that they might very well do it. For why may not *Heathens* be commended for their Justice, their Fortitude, their Temperance, Gratitude, &c.

He tells us likewise the same of *Hereticks*, that the *Catholicks* neither commend their Life or Doctrine. Indeed they have little Reason to expect it from them, who are resolved to speak well of none but those of their own Party and Way. And yet because the Cardinal lays so great a stress upon the *Confession of Adversaries*, and condescends to receive the Testimony of *Hereticks* (as he is pleased to call us) when it makes for his purpose, I shall at least produce on our own behalf as many Confessions from those he calls *Catholicks*, as he hath produced of ours on the behalf of his Church, and those also both with respect to our Lives and Doctrines.

And tho it be true that they of the Church of *Rome* have blackned *Luther*, and the other first Reformers, as Men of flagitious Lives; yet there will be found among them some who have given a better account of them.

I might give in a very fair account of *J. Hufs* and *H. of Prague*, from a Contemporary of their own Church, who knew them well, and conversed with them before they died. For *Martin Luther*, whatever the

the Romanists say of him now, yet certain it is that *Erasmus*, who I hope will pass with C. *Bellarmin* for a Catholick, who lived in his time, gives a better account of him. In his Letter to the Card. of York, speaking of *Luther*, Erasmi. Ep. l. xi. Ep. 1. he says: *Hominis vita magno omnium consensu probatur; jam id non leve prejudicium est, tantam esse morum integritatem, ut nec hostes reperiant quod calumnientur: His Life was then approved by all Men, and so entire were his Manners that his Enemies could find nothing to reproach him with.* Epist. l. v. Ep. 33. Again in a Letter to Ph. *Melancthon*; *Martini Lutheri vitam apud nos nemo non probat; i. e. All Men among us* (says he) *approve the Life of Martin Luther.* The same *Erasmus* says of *Oecolampadius*, that he meditated Ep. l. vii. Ep. 43. of nothing but of heavenly things. *Maldonat* the Jesuit, an allowed Catholick, and fierce Enemy to the Calvinists, says of them, that there appeared nothing in their Actions, but Alms, Temperance, and Modesty.

But their Doctrine is of greatest Concernment in this present Question. Let us see if any of our Adversaries of the Church of Rome have made any Confession in favour of our Doctrine. And here I will not enlarge; 'twill be enough to produce a few more Testimonies, and those more pertinent than what the Cardinal hath produced on the other side.

The Doctrine which our first Reformers preached, was not so absurd as 'tis by some represented: Many of the Church of Rome have spoken much in favour of our Doctrines. *Erasmus* did so of many of those Doctrines which *Luther* taught; *The Things*, says he, Epist. l. xxiii. Ep. 10. ibid. which *Luther* urgeth, if they were moderately handled, in my Opinion, come nearer to the Evangelical Vigor. And speaking of the Eucharist, he adds, that were he not moved by so great a Consent of the Church, he could embrace the Opinion of *Oecolampadius*:——He adds that he found

found no place in the Holy Scriptures where the Apostles are said to have consecrated Bread and Wine into the Flesh and Blood of the Lord. The same Erasmus elsewhere does profess that he *wisbeth that what Luther writes of the Tyranny, Covetousness, and Filthiness of the Court of Rome, had been false.*

Hist. Council.
Trent. l. i.

Cardinal *Matthæo Langi*, Archbishop of *Salzburg* told every one that the Reformation of the Mass was honest, the Liberty of Meats convenient, and a just Demand to be discharged of so many Commandments of Men ; but that a poor Monk should reform all was intolerable. The Doctrine was not so obnoxious as to offend the most moderate and considering Men of the Roman Church ; many of them have upon occasion frankly declared on our side.

See Bp. Mor-
ton's Appeal. l. i.

It hath been proved that *St. Gregory* the Great was no Friend to private Masses or Transubstantiation ; and 'tis well known that he renounced that Title of *Universal Bishop*, which is now claimed by the Popes of *Rome*. A learned Writer of our Church hath long ago produced many Witnesses of the Church of *Rome* that have born Testimony to the Doctrine of Protestants. E. g. The Doctrine of Purgatory was not for a long time universally believed in the Church, says *Polydore Virgil*. Some before *Luther* taught that Papal Indulgences were but a kind of Godly Cheat, says *Gregory de Valentia* : The Worship of Images was condemned by almost all the Fathers, says the same *Polydore Virgil*. The Authority of a Council is superior to that of the Pope, say the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil* : Marriage of Priests is not prohibited by Legal, or Evangelical Authority, but by Ecclesiastical, says *Gratian*. Venerable *Bede* owns two Sacraments on which the Church is founded : For many other things disputed

ted between us and them, we appeal to the Learned and Moderate Men amongst them, and doubt not to defend our Doctrines by Confessions of those of their own Church. Such are they of the number of Sacraments, the Primacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, &c. We make no doubt but to produce many Catholick Authors speaking on our side.

For Communion in both kinds, we have the Testimony of the Council of *Constance* and *Trent* that 'twas the ancient Practice.

For the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, one of the Communion of the Church of *Rome* hath given us an Account lately; he proves from many Doctors of the Church of *Rome*, that it is not ancient, viz. from *Peter Lombard*, from *Suarez*, *Scotus*, the Bishop of *Cambray*, Cardinal *Cusanus*, *Erasmus*, *Alphonfus à Castro*, *Tonstall*, and *Cassander*. And that 'tis not taught in the holy Scriptures, he proves from the Testimonies of *Scotus*, *Ockam*, *Gabriel Biel* and Cardinal *Cajetan*; and after all that it was not the Doctrine of the Fathers of the Church.

See a Treatise of Transubstantiation by one in the Communion of the Church of Rome. Printed 1687.

It would have been very fit I should here have made an end, having considered every thing which the Cardinal hath offered as to this Note of the Church. But there is a late Writer (I will not call him Author) hath taken the Confidence to produce the Testimony of the Jewish Writers in behalf of the Church of *Rome*; and, which is most surprising of all, he quotes the *Rabbins* in Defence of the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, which they are as far from asserting as he is from understanding them. The Cardinal was too learned and modest to attempt any thing of this Nature; but this Gentleman advanceth higher than he thought fit to do: What he offers speaks nothing

*Mr. Selater's
Consent. Ver.*

nothing so lowly as the Writers Effrontery and Ignorance, not to say something worse. Tho he thought fit to desert his Mother the Church of *England*, yet it little became him to fly in her Face, and suborn a Rout of *Jews* against her. His Discourse is so weak, that I shall bestow very little time and pains about it; I shall however say something to it that he may not think any Part of his Pamphlet unanswered, and do heartily wish him Repentance for his Folly, and that he may learn Modesty for the future.

And for my better proceeding in this matter, I shall do these things:

First, I will briefly shew the true use and value of the Testimony of *Jews* as to the Christian Religion.

Secondly, I shall shew the gross Ignorance (not to say Dishonesty) of this Writer in this Matter.

Thirdly, I shall prove that the Jewish Writers are so far from serving the Church of *Rome*, that they bear witness against it, and that also in this very matter of Transubstantiation.

First, I shall consider how far the Testimony of the *Jews* is useful to Christianity. And several such there are that serve the common Christianity.

1. The *Jews* as to matter of Fact confess that there was such a Man as *Jesus*, that he wrought wonderful Works. They do in their *Talmud* and elsewhere mention several of those Names which are mentioned in the New Testament, and are there mentioned to have been at the same time in which they are placed there. This is an useful Testimony, and serves the common Christianity, and saves us the labour in our Books against the *Jews* of proving these Matters of Fact.

2. They

2. They are also good Witnesses as to the Number of the Canonical Books of the Old Testament, which were deposited in their Hands. This is owned by Cardinal *Cajetan*, who affirms that this is one Advantage we receive from the Obstinacy of the *Jews*, that tho they believe not in Christ themselves, yet they approve the Books of the Old Testament, and therefore those Books cannot be supposed to have been invented by the Christians to have served their turn. This Testimony of theirs serves indeed the common Christianity, but is so far from serving the Church of *Rome*, that it is a good Evidence against the Council of *Trent*, who have receiv'd those Books for Canonical which the *Jews* never received into the Canon of Scripture.

*Cajetan in
Rom. xi. v. 11.*

3. They are good Witnesses of the *Promise of a Messias*, which is reckoned among the Fundamental Articles of the Jewish Faith. And this is an other Advantage that Christians receive (as *Cajetan* well observes in the Place mentioned before) from the Obstinacy of the *Jews*. They agree that such a Promise was made, and that therefore it cannot be supposed either a Forgery of the Christians, or a vain Belief peculiar only to them.

*Abravanel. C.
Fidei. c. 1.*

4. They are good Witnesses where they interpret those Texts of the Old Testament of the *Messias*, which belong to that matter, and which are by the Writers of the New Testament applied to that purpose: And the more ancient *Jews* do thus. The Chaldee Paraphrasts, and other of the more ancient Jewish Doctors do apply those Texts to him, which the *Christians* also understand to be spoken of him: Of which, were it not too great a Digression, it would be easy to produce very many Proofs: This serves the common Christiani-

ty greatly, and in our Disputes against the *Jews*, affords us very great Advantages.

5. Nor do I deny but that some of the Catholick Doctrines of the Christian Religion (I mean such as have been always believed from the first Beginning of Christianity) may receive some Confirmation from the Writings of the most antient Jewish Doctors. But to produce them as Witnesses, as this Writer does, to a Doctrine never received by the antient Church, is the most extravagant thing imaginable.

Secondly, I shall shew the gross Ignorance (not to say Dishonesty) of this Writer in this matter.

His Author, from whom he borrows all his *Rabbinical* Learning, is *Galatinus*: He tells (if we will believe him) that he was *always accounted a very learned Man*: It would have been more to his purpose to have vouched for his Honesty. After this he falls into a Fit of Devotion; he is of a sudden transported with Admiration, that the *Hebrew Writers long before Christ's time* (take Mr. *Sclater's* word for that) *should have such Notions; But the Wind bloweth where it listeth, &c.* He might have staid till he had been sure of the matter of Fact, and then 'twould have been time enough to admire at it. But the Reader is to know that Mr. *Sclater* was mightily inclined to believe in this matter with the Church of *Rome*, or else *Galatinus* could never by his Arguments have prevailed upon him. This appears from his own Words after he had drawn up his Evidence from *Galatinus*; he tells his Reader that *Galatinus thought* (and I'll assure you 'tis hard to say what a *Jew* that professeth himself a Convert to the Church of *Rome* does really think) *these Prophecies and Interpretations* (he might have called them Dreams and Figments) *argumentative, not only against*

Preface to Con-
sens. Veterum.

gainst the Jews, but a Confirmation also of the Christian Religion against all Hereticks, &c. But if you ask Mr. Sclater what confirms him in this Belief, you'll find him not hard to believe: *I am confirmed* (says he) *by the Title-page of his Book.* Of so great force is the Title-page of *Galatinus* his Book with Mr. Sclater of Putney.

This *Galatinus* was born a Jew, he was afterwards a Convert to the Church of Rome, and a Fryar; and pretends to discover something in the Hebrew Doctors to justify the Doctrines of the Roman Church, to which he had betaken himself. 'Tis certain that learned Men have represented him as a Man of no Sincerity, and have taken notice of his Falsity, and the Forgeries of his Book. *Johannes Mercerus*, a Man of singular Learning, and *Scaliger*, a great Judg, give this Account of him. And so also many others, and some of the more learned Men of the Church of Rome have done. *Sixtus Senensis* reprehends him for belying Pope *Clement 5.* *Joseph de Voisin*, a Priest of the Church of Rome, taxeth him of Ignorance of the Doctrine of the Jews. The best Character I find of him is that he was a Plagiary or Thief: He stole what is good out of the *Pugio Fidei* of *Raimundus*. For other things in his Book they are Figments and Forgeries, Trifles and ridiculous things. His Testimonies out of *Gale Razeiah* and *Zohar* are of no credit. *Jac. Maussacus*, and the above-named *Jos. de Voisin*, Authors against whom Mr. Sclater cannot except, will give the Reader this Account of him. In a word he was a Converted Jew (and what kind of Men they have proved I need not tell, nor can I think of that matter without sorrow) he is one that *Cardinal Bellarmin* thought not fit to quote in behalf of their Church, one that is condemned and stigmatized by the learned Men of the Church of Rome. But yet this

J. Mercer. in
Job ii. 11.

Scalig. Epist.
ad Casaubon.

Biblioth. St. l.
2.

J. Voisin The-
olog. Judæo-
rum p. 237.

Jac. Maussaci
Prolegom. in
Pug. Fid.

J. de Vois. ob-
servat. in Pro-
am.

Author hath so great force with Mr. *Sclater* of *Putney*, that he is confirmed by the very Title-page of his Book.

I should be vain if after this I should be operose in examining the Testimonies produced; and yet I cannot but reflect a little farther upon the stupid Ignorance or Insincerity of this Writer. He quotes *R. Solomon* for the Proof of Transubstantiation. All that *R. Solomon* says to his purpose, is that the LXXII Psalm is wholly meant of the Messias, and that many of their *Rabbins* interpreted that which we render *Handful of Corn*, of certain Sweet-meats or Dainties in the Days of Messias. It is very well known that the *Jews* fondly expect great feasting in the Days of the *Messias*, and no wonder that many of the *Rabbins* should interpret these Words of those Dainties. After all this *R. Solomon* gives another Interpretation of the Place. But what is all this to Transubstantiation? But be all that as it will: With what Face can he affirm that he produces several Jewish Masters when he produces not one? And yet he confidently attempts to name them, tho he bewray his great Ignorance in it. He says he produceth the Book *Siphre*, *R. Ira*, *Midras*, *Cohemoth*: where he reckons *Midras Cohemoth*, which is but the Title of one Book (*viz.* a Commentary of Ecclesiastes) for two *Rabbins*. This I dare say is Mr. *Sclater*'s own, he could not borrow it from the learned *Galatinus*. Mr. *Sclater* adds that he says, that by the Tops of the Mountains (in that Psalm) nothing can be more rightly designed, than the Prelates and Priests of the Church, in whom this Scripture is then fulfilled and verified when the Body of Christ is elevated. Now there is not one Syllable in *R. Solomon* of *Siphre*, *R. Ira*, *Midras Cohemoth*; not a word of the Priests and Prelats: All this

is

R. Sol. in 72.
16.

פסח בר
נלוסקאות
a modern Word
probably from
the Greek Word
πασχα.

V. Buxtorf.
Synagog. Jud.
l. 36.

Consent. Vet.
p 21.

is Mr. *Sclater's*: *Galatinus* himself affirms no such thing of *R. Solomon*; and therefore if by, *he produces*, Mr. *Sclater* mean *R. Solomon*, as any Reader will be apt to think, he wrongs him, for in truth he quotes none of those Authors tho *Galatinus* do. Pag. 21. l. 37.

For his first Quotation out of *R. Moses Haddurshan*, or, the Preacher, if we should allow it to be truly cited, yet any indifferent Reader will find it nothing to the purpose. For what follows is too transparent to gain belief; Besides that, a learned Society of *Hebricians* were many Years ago consulted about a Quotation of *Galatinus*, out of that *R. Moses*, who gave it under their Hands, that they found in the place quoted *nothing to the purpose*. Dr. Morton's. Catholick Ap-
peal. P. 394.

For his Citation out of *Mechilta*, tho there be nothing in it to the purpose, yet, if there had, he ought to have referred to the Page or Leaf of that Book, if he had done sincerely. P. 22.

For *R. Cahanah*, who he says was born before Christ, we have so little evidence of that, that it does not appear that there ever was any such Writer. P. 23.

And for *R. Johai* there is no such Author found, nor mentioned by any but *Galatinus*. P. 24.

For the Fable of *Elias* his being present at Circumcision, 'tis a *Jewish* Dream, the use he makes of it is ridiculous, and the Testimony of *R. Judas* a mere Figment. P. 24.

For the *Gale Razia*, cited by him, and what he cites from *Rabbenu Hak-kodesh* (by whom he should mean the Compiler of the *Jewish Misna*) they are mere Counterfeits. And Mr. *Sclater* is something unlucky, for he in his Book, instead of *Gale* hath *Gate*, and in his *Errata* he hath it *Gaize*. P. 25.

III. I shall prove that the *Jewish* Writers are so far from serving the Church of *Rome* by their Confession, that they bear witness against it, and that also in this very business of *Transubstantiation*.

And here it were easy to enlarge, and to bring abundant Proofs from Authors known and easily to be procured, and from such as have the greatest Reputation among the *Jews*.

The ancient *Jews* are on our side, as to the number of Canonical Books of the Old Testament. I could easily prove both from *Josephus* and *Philo* the *Jew*, that they are against that distribution of the Precepts of the Decalogue which obtains in the Church of *Rome*, and with us do reckon the Commandment against Images to be a distinct Precept, and the second in Number.

The Doctrine and Practice of *praying to Saints* and worshipping of Images, the *Jews* except against, the latter of which is against the very Letter of their Law.

The Doctrine of *Purgatory*, the Practice among Christians of *Crossing* themselves when it Thunders; the *Christening* of Bells; the Doctrine of the necessity of the Celibacy of Priests, the vowed Celibacy of *Monks* and *Nuns*, as well as the receiving of *Apocryphal* Books into the Canon of Scripture, and other Opinions and Practices in the Christian Church.

And for the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, as it is against the common Sense of Mankind, and destroys the certainty of every thing else, so the *Jews* upon all occasions object against it. We have a Witness beyond Exception, even of the *Roman* Church, who brings in the *Jews* objecting against this Doctrine, and representing the unreasonableness and absurdity of it from fourteen several

Joseph. Antiq.
Jud. l. iii. c. 4.
Philo Jud. de
Decalogo.

Nizach. Ver.
p. 128.
R. Isaac. p. 383.
Lipman. p. 16.
Lipman's Ni-
zachon. p. 25.
Nizach. Ver.
p. 23, 42, 43,
196.
R. Isaac Chizuk
Emuna. p. 345.

Portulitium
Fidei. Lugd.
Anno 1525.

several Heads of Argument, which I may not here represent to the Reader, because it would be too great a Digression. Nor do I find this Learned Author (who writes in Defence of the *Roman* Church, and attempts to answer these Objections) alledging that this was the Doctrine which was taught by the Hebrew Doctors. The *Jews* have so far abhorred this Doctrine, and so far detested Christians upon this account, that they were wont, when they made use of Christian Nurses, to force them to throw away their Milk for three Days together, before they gave suck, when it happened that at *Easter* these Nurses had received the Body and Blood of *Jesus Christ*. This *Pope Gregory* complains of, and decrees upon it that *Christians* should not for the future be Servants to the *Jews*. And *Josephus Albo* disputes against this Doctrine of Transubstantiation very vigorously; And so do many others, in their Books against *Christians*: And many more Testimonies might be produced, were not most of their Books printed in *Italy*, where it is not safe for them to be too plain. And Learned Men do very well know that the Passage in *Joseph Albo* against this Doctrine of the *Roman* Church hath been expunged in one Edition of that Author. 'Tis very well known that all the later *Jews* are against this Doctrine. And that *Trypho* the *Jew*, and the most ancient Writers have not objected it against *Christians*, is only an Argument that this Doctrine was not so old as the time in which they lived. This Doctrine the *Jews* are certain cannot be true, because if they are not certain of the Falsity of this, they have no Certainty of their own Religion, nor can ever be convinced of the Truth of ours. The Truth is, this is one great occasion of hardening them against Christianity; and we are never like:

Decret.
Gregor. l. v.
Tit. vi. cap. 13.
Accepimus autem, &c.

J. Albo Ikka-
rim.
V. Nizach. vet.
p. 255.
Lipman. Nizachon. p. 11.

like to see them come into the Christian Church, till this Doctrine of Transubstantiation, and the Worship of Images be removed out of it. But then the Practice annexed to the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, of worshipping a Creature, is so dangerous, that even they who own the Doctrine, confess, if that be not true, they cannot be excused from Idolatry.

God give us a just Sence of these things, that we may not hereafter have, besides our own Sins, which will be load great enough, the Obstinacy of the *Jews* in great measure to answer for.

T H E E N D.

L O N D O N,

Printed by *J. D.* for *Richard Chiswell* at the Rose and Crown in
St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1687.

The Fourteenth Note of the CHURCH
EXAMINED,

V I Z,

The unhappy End of the Church's Enemies.

Decima quarta Nota est Infelix exitus, seu finis eorum qui Ecclesiam oppugnant. Bellarm. L. iv. c. 17. de Notis Ecclesiæ.

I M P R I M A T U R.

July 27. 1687.

Guil. Needham.

IF he be an unwise Builder, who pulls down what he intends to build up; then Cardinal *Bellarmin* (tho one of the Master-Builders of the Church of *Rome*) deserves not to be reckon'd one of the wisest: For he must shut his Eyes close, who does not plainly see, that he frequently defeats his own Design; by giving Notes, which conclude that Church to be false, which he design'd to prove was the *only true* one. Such, for instance, is that, which is now to be consider'd, as shall in the Sequel of this Discourse be made appear.

The Confutation of which cannot be difficult, since I find nothing in the whole Chapter that hath so much as the shew of an Argument. Whereas some of his Notes are guarded, with a pretence, at least, of Scrip-

Y y

turc,

ture, Reason and Antiquity ; this is exposed naked to the Assaults of its Adversaries, without so much as a Paper Shield to protect it. He tells us indeed many Tragical Stories of *unhappy Deaths*, some of which are true, some doubtful, and others false ; some of Persons who were deadly Enemies, other of Persons who were zealous Defenders of the true Church : But had the Stories been all certainly true, and had the Persons who thus died been all of them implacable Enemies of the Church of *Rome* ; yet what does it signify, unless he had also proved, That when a Person dies an unnatural Death, the meaning of it is, 'That that Church of which he professed himself a Member, is false ; and the Church he opposed, the only true one ? But how unwise soever he was in the choice of his Note, he was so wise, as not to attempt the proof of this, unless the Citation of this Scripture may pass for a Proof, *Praise his People, O ye Nations, for he will avenge the Blood of his Servants, and will render Vengeance to his Enemies* (a). God will avenge the Blood of his Servants: therefore if a Protestant die an unhappy Death, the Church of *Rome* is the *only true Church*.

(a) Deut. 32. 43

But why did the Cardinal send out this Note, so forlorn ? For a good Reason : because no Defence could be found for it. But why did he then bring it into the Field ? Because he knew it was Popular, and might serve the Cause better than another, that was never so well fenc'd. For will not he dread to oppose the Church of *Rome*, who is persuaded, that God will set a *Note* of Vengeance upon those that do so ? Will not he steadfastly adhere to it, who believes, that that is a certain way to an happy Death ? In short, whosoever can be persuaded to believe, that the Church of *Rome* is by this Note distinguish'd from all other Churches, he will as
much

much dread to turn Protestant, as he does to die the most prodigious sort of Death.

But the Mischief is, That however serviceable this pretended Note may be to them among weak and undiscerning Persons, it will do there as much disservice among those who are judicious and able to examine it: For when they shall once see, what a palpable Cheat it is; and in case, that it were a Note of the true Church, that the Church of *Rome* hath the least Reason of any Church in the World to pretend to it, they will be thereby disposed to break off from the Communion of that Church which contradicts its own Marks, and betake themselves to some other Church, which hath a better Title to them. For the effecting of which, I shall proceed in this Method.

I. I shall premise some Things as preparatory to what follows.

II. Shew, that this can be no Note of the true Church.

III. That in case it were, the Protestant Church would be the true Church, rather than the Church of *Rome*.

I. I shall premise these five Things as preparatory to what follows.

1. That by an *unhappy End*, *Bellarmin* means, That which is so in outward Appearance, to the Eye of Sense, or according to the Judgment of the World. Such as a violent, or sudden, or infamous, or any kind of strange or unusual Death; especially such in which there is an appearance of the Divine Vengeance. As to be devour'd by Dogs, or eaten up of Vermin, to be flea'd or burnt alive; for a Man to kill himself, or to be kill'd by his

Servants, to be smitten by a Thunderbolt, &c. In a word, any such End, as either in its Nature, or in its Circumstances, is not the usual or common End of Men.

2. *Bellarmin* meant this, not barely for the Note of a Church, but of that which is the *only true Church*. For since, besides the common Faith, in which all Christians agree, there are many points in which they differ, and by which they are divided among themselves into several Parties, he supposing that no more than one of these can be a true Church, and therefore that that *one* must be the *only true Church*, his work was to furnish us with such Notes, by which this *one Church* might be known and distinguish'd from all the rest. And therefore,

3. The Instances he produces of Unhappy Deaths are for the greater part impertinent, because the Persons were such as were Enemies not to this or that Christian Church as distinguished from another, but to Christianity it self, and endeavour'd the total extirpation of it out of the World. So did the Emperors, *Nero, Domitian, Dioclesian*, the Apostate *Julian*, &c. And those Hereticks, *Simon Magus, Manichæus*, &c. were not more opposite to the Church of *Rome*, than to any other Christian Church. There is nothing therefore in these Instances by which one Christian Church may be distinguish'd from another; nothing by which the Church of *Rome* may be marked out for the true Church, rather than the Church of *Antioch* or *Alexandria*.

And as those direful Deaths of the Heathen Persecutors, and Apostate Christians, gave no peculiar advantage to the Church of *Rome then*; so they make much against the Church of *Rome now*: For if they signified (as *Bellarmin* would have them) that Church to be the true Church

Church which was then opposed by them, it plainly follows that the Church of *Rome now*, is not a true Church, and that the Church of *England is*; because the Church of *Rome now* is not the same Church it was *then*: it hath *now* another Faith, by which it is become another Church; whereas the Church of *England* is the same now it was at first, yea the same now that the Church of *Rome* was then; it having purged her self from those Corruptions, which have been since introduced by the Church of *Rome*, and reduced it self to the Primitive Faith. Those other Examples of Tragical Deaths, which if they had been true, would have been more to the purpose, shall be anon considered.

4. Observe, that the *unhappy End* of those who defend it, must be a Note of a false Church, if the *unhappy End* of those who oppose it be a Note of the true. The Reason is plain; because those who defend it, in doing so, they must oppose that Church that opposes it; if they therefore have an *unhappy End*, the opposite Church will have this Note of the only true Church, and by Consequence, that Church they defend in opposition to it, must be a false Church.

5. Observe that from God's Judgments against particular Persons, nothing can be concluded against that Church of which they are Members. The Reason is manifest, because God's Judgments upon particular Persons are usually inflicted for particular personal Crimes, as in the case of *Nadab and Abihu*, *Ananias* and *Sapphira*. These things being premised, I proceed to shew,

II. That this can be no Note of the true Church; which I might prove at large, by shewing that it is destitute of all those Conditions which Cardinal *Per-*

(b) Reply to K.
James. 1. 1. c. 5.
(c) De Not.
Ecclef. c. 2.

ron (b) and *Bellarmin* himself (c) makes necessary to every true Note. But because this Method hath been already observed in the Examination of some of the foregoing Marks, I shall therefore wave the Advantages it would afford me; nor do I indeed stand in need of them, because the Vanity and Falsity of it will be otherwise sufficiently manifest, both by Scripture, Experience and Reason:

First, By Scripture. And,

(d) Ecclef. 9.
1, 2, 3.

1. By all those Scriptures which declare, that *all things come alike to all Men*: That in the common course of Providence, there is no difference put between the *Righteous* and the *Wicked*, between him that *sacrificeth* and him that *sacrificeth not* (d); and by a plain Parity of Reason, he that *persecutes* the true Religion, and he that *defends* it; he that worships God aright, and he that worships him amiss, or not at all, as to outward Events, hath frequently the same Lot; As King *Josiah*, the Restorer and Maintainer of the true Religion, and who served the Lord with all his Heart, died the same unnatural Death that *Ahab* did, who served *Baal*, and provoked the Lord to Anger more than all the Kings of *Israel* that were before him. Nor was this promiscuous Dispensation of Events taken notice of only by wise *Solomon*, but we find it long before affirmed by *Job*, that *God destroys both the Perfect and the Wicked* (e): Righteous *Abel*, the first Man that ever died, was a Proof of it; he whose Sacrifice was by God accepted, fell himself a Sacrifice to his wicked Brother's Envy.

(e) Job 9. 22.

Nor was it thus, only before the Law, and under the Law, but it continues so still now under the Gospel. The Tares and the Wheat, though sown by different

Hands, the one by the Son of Man, the other by the Devil, yet as they grow up together in the same Field, so they are gathered and cut down by the same Reapers, by the same Sickle, and are not sever'd, the one for the Fire, and the other for the Barn, till the End of the World.

Yea in plain Contradiction to this Note, the Scripture tells us, *That there are just Men to whom it happeneth according to the work of the Wicked, and there are wicked Men to whom it happeneth according to the work of the Righteous* (f). And that not only in the Course of their Lives, but when they die too. For *there is a just Man that perisheth in his Righteousness, and there is a wicked Man that longeth his Days in his Wickedness* (g). The good Man is sometimes cut off by an early Death, because he is better than others; and the Wicked, whose Sins cry aloud for Vengeance, prolongs his Days in his Wickedness; and after a long and prosperous Life, hath an honourable Death and Burial; for *I saw, says Solomon, the Wicked buried* (h); that is (as Cardinal Cajetan expounds the Words) in such a pompous Sepulchre, as transmits an honourable Memory of them to Posterity.

(f) Eccl. 8. 14.

(g) Eccl. 7. 15.

(h) Eccles. 8. 10.

I grant, that the Notes of Divine Vengeance are in some Mens Deaths fairly legible. But then, as I have before observed, from God's Judgments against this or that Person, nothing can be concluded against that Church of which they are Members.

2. Besides these general Declarations, the Scripture further assures us by a particular Instance, that a true Church may be without this Mark, and that the Enemies of the true Church may have it. Thus the Church of *Israel* was without it, and the uncircumcised *Philistines* had it, when the High Priest fell backward and brake.

(1) 1 Sam. 3.

brake his Neck, and his two Sons *Hophni* and *Phineas* with thirty thousand of the *Israelites* fell in one day by the Sword of the *Philistins* (i). Again, when *Zedekiah* the Defender of the true Church, was taken, his Nobles slaughtered, his Sons slain before his Eyes, his Eyes then put out, and he carried Captive to *Babylon*, and put in Prison till the day of his Death: If this was then a Note of the Church, the *Babylonians* were the only true Church of God, for their Enemies had then the most unhappy Ends: So contrary is this Note to what we find in Scripture.

Secondly, Nor is it less repugnant to daily Observation, and the History of foregoing Ages. For,

(2) Job 21.
26.

1. All the World can testify that the same kind of Death happens to Men of different, yea of opposite Churches. That as dies the Christian, so dies the Jew; as dies the Catholick, so dies the Heretick. That the Protestant and Papist *lie down ALIKE in the Dust*, to use *Job's* Phrase (k). That as they often agree in their Deaths, who while they lived, were of different Churches; so they often widely differ, who were united in the same. One hath a natural, another a violent Death; one falls by the Hand of God, another by the Hand of his Neighbour; one goes off gently in a Calm, another is hurried away in a Storm; one lives out the Term of Nature, another is cut off in the midst of his Days; one dies leisurely, another is snatched away suddenly; one finds a Grave in the Earth, another in the Sea, another finds none at all, but is exposed as a Prey to Beasts and Birds. This is so obvious, that it is needless to produce Instances for the Confirmation of it.

2. Whosoever has any Acquaintance with the History of
of

of the Christian Church, knows, that for several of the first Ages at least, the best Men had generally the worst Deaths: That the Apostles of our blessed Lord were set forth as a Spectacle to the World, suffered the Deaths of the basest Malefactors; that *St. Peter* and *St. Andrew* were crucified, *St. James* the Just stoned, and his Brains knocked out with a Club, *St. Bartholomew* head alive: That not one of the Apostles can be named, who did not end his Life by an unnatural Death, except only *St. John*, who escaped it by Miracle, for he was cast into a Cauldron of boiling Oil.

That the first Bishops (their Successors) followed them in the like Tragical Deaths: That *St. Clemens* Bishop of *Rome* was thrown into the Bottom of the Sea; *St. Simeon* Bishop of *Jerusalem* crucified; *St. Ignatius* Bishop of *Antioch* exposed to the Lions; *St. Polycarp* Bishop of *Smyrna* burnt at a Stake: Yea that the Christians for the most part for three hundred Years together, met with the most horrid Deaths: One was torn in pieces by wild Beasts, another was roasted on a Spit, another was broiled on a Gridiron, another had his Flesh scraped off to the Bones with sharp Shells, and Salt and Vinegar poured into his green Wounds; and for one of their bloody Persecutors, an hundred Christians may be found who died a terrible Death. These were the *happy Ends* that the first and best Christians were blessed with; happy indeed if we respect the Cause for which they died, and the blessed Reward they were crowned with; but none ever more unhappy in the Eye of the World. As they had been of all Men the most miserable, had they had Hope in this Life only; so, if this Note be true, their Hope could not have reached beyond it.

3. Nor is this Note more repugnant to Scripture and Experience, than it is to Reason. One prime fundamental Principle of Reason is, That Contradictions cannot be true; or, that the same thing, cannot be, and not be. This we are as sure of, as that we our selves are, or that any thing else is; whatsoever therefore it be from whence it plainly follows, that Contradictions may be true, we are as sure that it is false; and therefore that the Note now under consideration is so, because if it be true, the most palpable Contradictions will be true also. Of those many that offer themselves, I shall mention a few. As,

1. That that was a false Church, which was most certainly the true Church. For if the burning alive of *Valens* the *Arian* Emperor was a certain Sign that the *Arian* Faith is false; the burning alive of many of the first Christians is as certain a Note that the Primitive Faith is false. If it follows, that *Manichæus* was a damnable Heretick because he was fled alive, must we not conclude that St. *Bartholomew* was as bad (and by consequence all the holy Apostles) because he suffered the same kind of Death?

2. That a Church remaining the same, without any Change in Doctrine, Worship or Discipline, may be to day a false Church, to morrow the only true Church. So the Church of *Israel* was a false one, when the High Priest fell backward and brake his Neck; within a few days after, when the Hand of the Lord was against the *Philistines*, and they were smitten with a foul Disease, of which they miserably died, it was a true Church again. Thus the Church of *Rome* in the Year 1656, when a dreadful Pestilence (for that is one of *Bellarmin's* unhappy Ends) swept away three hundred thousands in three Months time, in the Kingdom of
Naples,

Naples, and made great havock at *Rome* and *Genoa* †, was a false Church; but in the Year 1665, when the like dreadful Pestilence raged in *London*, it became a true Church again. Yea,

† Achanas. Kircheri Scrutin. Physico-Med. Contag. Luis quæ dicitur Pestis. P. 426.

3. That there is no one Church in the World, but by this Note, it may be, and it may not be the true Church; because the Opposers and the Defenders of any one and the same Church, may have both of them unhappy, and both of them happy Ends. Now as the Opposers have unhappy Ends, it is a true Church; as the Defenders have unhappy Ends it is (by the fourth thing premised) a false one. Again, as the Opposers have an happy End, it is a false Church; as the Defenders have an happy End, it is a true one. Thus for Example, the Church of *England* is both a true Church and a false; *Queen Elizabeth* lived and died happily, the *Spaniards*, her and its great Enemies in 88, died unfortunately, therefore it is the only true Church: King *Charles* the First of Blessed Memory, had an unhappy End, the Usurper died quietly in his Bed, therefore it is a false Church. I bring the Church of *England* only for an Instance, the same is as true of the Church of *Rome*, and, I doubt not, of any other Division of Christians of what Denomination soever.

And is not this now a fine Note, to find out the true Church by? when no false Church can be found, that will not by it be the only true one; and on the contrary, no true Church can be mention'd, that will not be a false one. Yea, (which is more) when that which is indeed the *only* true Church, (the Church Catholic) will by this Note be no Church; for not only its Enemies, but its Friends, too do often die unfortunately; and its Enemies as well as its Friends, have frequently such Deaths, as in the Eye of the World are most happy.

4. Whereas it is a Contradiction to say, That the *only* true Church can be more than *one*, if this Note stand good, it will be *many*; so many different Churches as there are in the World, so many *only* true Churches will there be, one only excepted. So when a Pope dies miserably (as all the World knows, the Popes have frequently done), then every Church in the World, the *Roman* only excepted, is the only true Church; because the Pope is an Adversary to every one of them (and this, as appeared by the third thing premised, is made by *Bellarmin* the Note of the *only* true Church). Yea,

5. Those very Protestant Churches which *Bellarmin* design'd to mark out for false, will by this Note be true Churches, and that which he would conclude the *only* true Church, will be a false one.

1. The *Lutherans* and *Calvinists*, he says, are not true Churches, because *Luther* and *Calvin* died miserably (that they so died, I shall presently shew is false). But be it true, what follows? If *Luther* died miserably, then the *Calvinists* are the true Church: If *Calvin* died miserably, then the *Lutherans* are the true Church; for *Luther* and *Calvin* opposed each other, as well as both of them the Church of *Rome*.

2. That the Church of *Rome* that he would make to be the *only* true Church, will by this Note be concluded a false one, I shall shew in speaking to the next Head, and therefore now pass it. I think by this time not only the Vanity, but the Falseness of this Note is sufficiently manifest.

III. Let us now suppose it a Note of the true Church, and see who will have the best on't. The advantage will lye so clearly on the Protestant side, that the *Romanists* themselves will be found to confess it.

I grant, That those horrid Deaths, which have by the Church of *Rome* been inflicted upon those who have opposed her Errors, are a Mark by which she is made as visible, as her City seated upon the seven Hills; those who have thus died are more than can be numbered, and their Deaths were many of them, both for Nature and Circumstances the most monstrous: But this, I trow, does not mark her out for the *Sponse of Christ*, but for that *Woman that is drunken with the Blood of the Saints, and with the Blood of the Martyrs of Jesus*; She is not therefore, I think, ambitious of this Mark, but would rather hide it, tho' it is so deeply branded upon her, that she will never be able to rub it out. If therefore these be set aside, which I am confident the Church of *Rome* is very willing they should be, and would be glad if all Histories were *burnt* too, in which their *Burnings* are left on Record; let us see whether Church, the Roman or the Protestant, hath the fairest Plea to this Note. This will be soon determin'd, by comparing the Deaths of their Prime Members, and Zealous Champions, and then considering on which side we find the greater number of such as are unnatural, and not common to Men.

1. For the Protestants. The chief Assertors of the Protestant Interest, are either their Bishops and other eminent Pastors and Teachers; or those Secular Princes who have under God, been the great Defenders and Protectors of the Protestant Faith.

As for their Bishops, and other eminent Pastors and Teachers, they are without number who have died the most happy Deaths, such as *Jewel, Whitaker, Usher, Hall, Morton, Jackson, Melancthon, Bucer, Musculus, Zanchy, Farellus, Beza, Ursinus, Gryneus, &c.* whose Deaths were not only placid and pious, but attended with those
lively

lively Hopes of a Blessed Immortality, as recommended their Religion to its Adversaries.

But it is not so much my business to tell you whose Deaths were happy, as out of that number, to select those that were unhappy. And I think we may take it for granted, that the number of these is very small, in that their profess'd Adversary who labour'd to make the most of every thing against them, hath mention'd no more than Five, (*viz. Luther, Zuinglius, Oecolampadius, Carlostadius, and Calvin.*) Now suppose it true, That all these died as miserably as *Bellarmin* would have the World believe: yet what are five to that numberless number, who have had the most auspicious Deaths? Will not the Argument for the Truth of their Church from those that died happily, as much exceed that against it, from those that died miserably, as the number of the one, exceeds that of the other? So that if the true Church be concluded by this Argument, it is ten thousand to one, but the Protestant Church is the *only* true Church.

But what shall we say if the Deaths of all but one of these five be misrepresented? And what he says of that one, and two of the other (if it were true) be no Argument of an unhappy Death? Whether it be so, or no, I shall now briefly examin.

He begins with *Luther*. He (says the Cardinal) died suddenly, for whereas in the Evening he was merry and in Health, and had provoked all that were present to Laughter, by his Jest, the same Night he was found dead (1).

(1) Lutherus morte repentina sublatus est; nam cum vesperi opiparam cenam sumpsisset latus & sanus, & sacris suis omnes ad risum provocasset, eadem nocte mortuus est. *Bellarmin.*

Grant this were true: A sudden Death is not always, and to all Persons unhappy. But suppose it were, it ill

becomes

becomes a Papist to object it ; since it is no more than what hath been the Lot of many of their Popes : For so died Pope *Nicholas III* (m), and Pope *Clemens VI* (n), as their own Writers witness.

tamen morte correptus, &c. *Plat. in Vit. Nic. III.* (n) ——— Vergente hoc eodem anno *Clemens*, cum Apostolicum solium annos decem menses septem tenuisset, præcipiti morbo ex humanis ereptus est. *Raynald. ad an. 1352. n. 21.*

But *Luther* had eat a lusty Supper, and was merry and jocular the Evening before. And so had several of their Popes, the next Evening before they died. Pope *Paul II*, after he had supp'd most jollily, and perswaded himself that he had many Years to live, the same Night died of an Apoplexy (o). Pope *Leo X*, led constantly a merry Life, but his Death happen'd in the highest excess of Feasting, Mirth, and Jollity; and so suddenly, that there was not time afforded for Absolution, and Extreme Unction (p). And if *Luther* jested the Day before he died, methinks it might have passed without any severe Censure, since Sir *Tho. More* (the Pope's Martyr) was so sportful upon the Scaffold, and died with a Jest in his Mouth.

Apoplexia correptus, vitam cum morte mutavit. *Johan. Still. Anno 1454. p. 262.*

(p) Ex hujus victoriæ nuncio Leonem Pontificem ingenti diffusum gaudio referunt, in qua Apoplexia correptus, nullis perceptis Sacramentis, ætatis anno quadragesimo sexto nondum ex-
acto, decessit inopina morte. *Raynald. ad an. 1521. n. 108.*

—— Die infrequenti lætitiæ pompam sua morte clausit, inopina quidem adeo, ut ne Sacramen-
tis quidem munus fuerit. *N. 109.*

But what credit is to be given to his Enemies, we may learn from those monstrous Tales they spread concerning his Death, not only after, but long before it : Such as that horrible Miracle wrought at his Funeral for the Conviction of Hereticks, which he confuted with his own Hand. And it is not unpleasant to read, how they

they contradict one another. One says, That he purged out his Entrails, like *Arius*; Another, That his Mouth was distorted, and his whole right Side turned to a duskyish Colour. But above all, commend me to *Thyraus* the Jesuit. He confidently tells us, That in a Town of *Brabant*, named *Cheol*, there were many Persons possess'd with Devils, who were brought thither to be cured by the Intercessions and Prayers of the Saint of the Place: That these poor Creatures were on a sudden deliver'd from these Evil Spirits, and that this was the very Day that *Luther* died; That the day after the Devils return'd again into the same Bodies, and being asked, whither they were gon the day before? answer'd, That by the Commandment of their Prince, they were call'd forth to attend the Soul of their Grand Prophet and Companion *Luther*. This Fable, as ridiculous, as it is malicious, is quoted at large, and credited, by as considerable a Man as *Florimond de Ramond* (r). He, I say, that shall reflect upon these things, will not be apt to believe the Reports of his Adversaries.

(r) De la Naissance de l'Herésie. l. 3. c. 11. p. 332.

If we take the account of his Death from *Sleidan*, we shall find it very different, and such as was every way becoming a most pious and devout Christian (s). But it will be said, that he was his Friend, and therefore as little to be credited as his Enemies.

(s) Jo. Sleid. Comment. l. 17.

Hear therefore what many Learned Men of the Church of *Rome* say, who cannot be suspected of any partiality in Favour of him. *The Fathers in Trent*, (saith Father *Paul*) and the Court of *Rome*, conceived great hope, seeing that so potent an Instrument, to contradict the Doctrine and Rites of the Church of *Rome*, was dead, &c. and the rather because that Death was divulged throughout Italy, with many prodigious and fabulous Circumstances, which were ascribed to Miracle, and the Vengeance of God,

tho there were but the usual accidents, which do ordinarily happen in the Deaths of Men of sixty three Years of Age (t). So that in Father Paul's judgment, there was nothing in his Death, but what was common. Yea, that the very worst Circumstances were no other than such Accidents which happen also many times to VERY GOOD CHRISTIANS, is acknowledged by a late Adversary (u), who hath written a Book on purpose to disparage him. Yea, that he died in great Honour, as well as piously, another hath informed us. After Supper (says Thuanus) immediately before the Night in which he departed, when he was ask'd, Whether in the Eternal Life we shall know one another? he said, that we should, and confirmed it by Testimonies of Scripture. As many strove who should best express their Love to him while he lived, so neither by Death could they be drawn from loving him. The Citizens of Mansfield contended that he ought to be buried with them, because that was his Native Soil; but the Authority of Frederick, the Prince Elector, prevail'd, that he should be carried to Wittenberg, and there honourably Interr'd (w.) And indeed the transcendent Honour that was done to his Memory, seems to be that which chiefly provoked his Enemies, to set their Inventions on work to defame him.

(t) Hist. of the
Counc. of Trent.
l. 2. p. 149.

(u) Spirit of
Mart. Luth.
P. 104.

(w) Post ex-
nani proxime
ante noctem
qua decessit,
cum rogare-
tur, cum in il-
la sempiterna
vita simus alter

alterum agnitori, ita esse aiebat, & Scripturæ testimoniis confirmabat. Ut certatim eum vi-
vum, &c. Thuan. Hist. l. 2.

The Cardinal's next Instance of an unhappy End is Zuinglius. And why is his Death reckon'd unhappy? Because he was slain in a War against Catholicicks (x). But is it a strange thing for a Man to be kill'd in a War? Does every one that so ends his Days, die miserably? If so, How many Millions hath the Pope brought to a miserable End, in sending them to the Wars against Sara-

(x) Zuinglius
in bello contra
Catholicos tru-
cidatus est.
Bell. 21 m.

cens and *Hereticks*? O, that they'l say is a glorious Death, that merits the brightest Crown in Heaven! But *Zuinglius* was kill'd in a War against Catholicks.

But stay, the Cardinal makes them Catholicks too soon, he supposes them Catholicks before *Zuinglius* was kill'd, whereas he was to prove them Catholicks by his being kill'd, for his unhappy Death is the Note now under debate, by which they were to be known to be of the true Church.

But that his Death could be no Argument that God disapproved the cause in which he died, is evident; because to the great grief of our Adversaries the Reformed Religion which they hoped would have died together with him, made a greater Progress after his Death, than it had done before. I shall speak but a word to the two next, because the Cardinal's Spite is chiefly against *Calvin* who brings up the rear.

Oecolampadius (says *Bellarmin*) *in the Evening went well to Bed, and in the Morning was, by his Wife, found dead in his Bed* (y). For this also he quotes *Cochlaus*, though he says not *that he went well to Bed*. And so far is it from being true, that he had for a long time been ill, and for fifteen days before confin'd to his Bed: But grant it true, I have said enough before in answer to it, in the Vindication of *Luther*. I shall only add; That before the Cardinal had brought this for an Instance of an unhappy Death in Protestants, he should have prov'd, that Papists are not as subject to Apoplexies, or any other Disease which causes a sudden stoppage of the Circulation in the Heart, as Protestants are.

(z) *Andream Carolostadium a Dæmone interfectum, Ministri Basileenses scribunt, in Epistola quam ediderunt de morte Carolostadii, Bellarm.*

For *Carolostadius*, the Ministers of *Basil* (he tells us) *in an Epistle they publish't concerning his Death, write that he was kill'd by the Devil* (z). He has not told us where this Epistle is, and I despair of ever finding it. I shall therefore

therefore send the Reader to *Petrus Boquinus*, a Student at *Basil* when *Caroloſtadius* died, and attended his Funeral, who hath given an account of his Death, and expoſed this impudent Forgery; as I find him quoted by *Melchior Adams* (a).

(a) In vita Caroloſtadii.

I am now come to the fifth and laſt Act of this Tragedy, which is ſo lewd a Calumny, that any Man but an Advocate for their Church, might be aſhamed to own it, viz. *John Calvin was eaten up of Worms, as Antiochus, Herod, Maximinus and Hunricus were*; and not only ſo, but *invoking the Devils, he died blaſpheming and curſing* (b). But what Authority has the Cardinal for this? the Teſtimony of *Bolſec*, a Man of ſo proſtituted a Fame, and whoſe Lies are ſo groſs, that many Popiſh Writers who have ſtudied to blacken *Calvin*, have been aſhamed to own him.

(b) Joannes Calvinus verbis conſumptus expiravit, ut Antiochus, Hero-

des, Maximinus & Hunricus, teſtatur Hieronymus Bolſecus in ejus vita. Qui etiam addit, cum Dæmonibus invocatis, blaſphemantem & execrantem obiiſſe. *Belſam.*

The Charge is twofold: 1. That he was eaten up of Worms. 2. That invoking the Devils, he died blaſpheming and curſing: both which are as falſe, as any thing ever forged by the Father of Lies.

1. That he was eaten up of Worms, by which is meant the lowly Evil, as may be ſeen by *Bolſec's* Words quoted in the Margin (c). Now were this true, yet if we may believe a Learned Man of the Church of *Rome* (who was one of *Calvin's* irreconcilable Enemies) it is not to be look'd upon as ſo ſtrange a thing; for he has undertaken to prove that nothing is more natural, than for the Body of Man to

(c) Sed ad Calvinum noſtrum, & ad graviffimos ejus, varioſq; morbos quibus miſere ad extrêmum uſque Spiritum excruciatuſ fuit; revertamur, quem præter eos quos Beza referente commemoravimus, eo quoque morbi genere afflictuſ conſtat, quo juſto Dei judicio, quodaſam maniſeſtos, & apertos Dei hoſtes, qui divinum Honorem atq; Gloriam invaſerant, ſibiq; uſurparant, vexatos punitoſq; legimus, iſ eſt pediculariſ. Nam & hi Vermes, &c. Vita Joan. Calv. c. 22.

(d) Vasseur
 Annal de l'E-
 glise Cathed.
 de Noyon. p.
 720, 721.

breed Vermine and Lice, and produc'd many famous Men who have died of this Disease (d). It must indeed be acknowledged, that the lowfy-Evil, is not always a Sympton meerly natural, but a vindicative Effect of the Almighty, when, without any Reason in the Humours or state of the Body sufficient to cause that loathsome Disease, it appears to the Destruction of some notorious Sinner. Yet it is certain that this Distemper is naturally incident to humane Bodies, since Lice do seem to consist (chiefly) of that Salt, which, together with other Humours does copiously breath through their Pores. This Truth may be reasonably gathered from the Chymical Resolution of Lice, and from their medicinal Powers and Effects in some Distempers. Besides that, I have been assured by a Learned Gentleman (much addicted to Physical Experiments) that he formerly having three or four days together visited Glass-furnaces, attending on some Experiments there made, has taken from the Backs of the Glass-makers (after they had sweated profusely in the same Shirts three days together) a great quantity of dry Salt, which was caked on the outside of their Shirts, and that this Salt being put into a Glass, and set two or three days in a sunny Window, did all become a body of little creeping things like Lice. If therefore the Salt which exhales through the Pores of Mans Body be the matter of Lice, the considering Physician may give good Reason, why and how the Disease may be produced, as it often happens to be, in Bodies first decayed, and disposed to such a Malady by other Diseases, where the Putrefaction of Humours, and the Resolution of the animal Salts being very great, and the internal Heat and Motion, which should carry them through the Pores, being too little, this unctuous and saline matter stops in them,
 and

and there stays long enough to be animated into Lice, which as soon as unlivened creep forth in abundance, and are successively followed by dreadful numbers of the same Generation, so long as the Patient lives. But I shall say no more of the natural Causes from whence this Evil may sometimes proceed; but supposing it now to be as certain a Token of the Divine Vengeance, as *Bellarmino* would have it, I shall shew these two things:

1. That *Calvin* did not die of this Disease.
2. In case he did, the Church of *Rome* hath no reason to triumph in it.

1. That *Calvin* did not die of this Disease. This will I think be manifest: 1. By reflecting upon the first Author of this Story. 2. By considering what others, both Papists and Protestants (of unquestionable Authority) have written concerning *Calvin's* Diseases and Death.

1. By reflecting upon the first Author of this Story. *Bolsec* was the Man who first told this Tale to the World, and not till thirteen years after *Calvin's* Death. All the rest, *Surius*, *Lingens*, *Lessius*, &c. are beholden to him for it. Nor do I wonder that they licked up his Vomit: but it may seem more strange that Cardinal *Bellarmino* should, if we consider these two things:

1. That he was *Calvin's* mortal Enemy. 2. That many Papists who have made it their Study to defame *Calvin*, are ashamed of him.

1. That he was *Calvin's* mortal Enemy. One main occasion of his Enmity was this: *Bolsec*, having quitted his Habit (for he was a Carmelite Frier at *Paris*) turn'd Quack, and came to *Geneva*, where finding himself in no esteem among the learned Physicians, he resolved to set

set up for a Divine; for something he delivered about Predestination, he was first gently reproved by *Calvin*; but he more boldly insisting again upon it, he was then confuted by him openly in the Congregation, exposed to publick Shame, and by the Magistrate committed to Custody as a seditious Person, and not long after by the Senate banished the City. This publick Disgrace he would never forgive *Calvin*, but ever after bore a mortal Hatred against him, though he durst not openly proclaim it, till after *Calvin* was remov'd into another World, and out of a capacity of confuting his Calumnies. This alone is enough, the *Romanists* themselves being Judges, to overthrow the Credit of this Story. I might also add, that *Bolssec* was a necessitous indigent Person, and a Man of debauch'd Morals, and so every way qualified for the feigning of a Story, which he was well assured would be amply rewarded.

2. So gross are his Impostures, that many Learned Papists, who have made it their study to defame *Calvin*, are ashamed to quote them. *Florimond de Ramond*, speaking of *Calvin*; *From this Head* (saith he) *as from Pandora's Box, are come forth all those Troops of Evils, all those Legions of Miseries, and those Torrents of Blood, which have overflow'd the better part of Europe—* He that would know all these particulars, let him read the Authors who have taken the pains to write them. And then quoting *Surinus*, *Bolssec*, and some others in the

(e) Qui en vont-
dra scavoir
toutes les par-
ticularitez, life
les Auteurs qui
ont pris la peine de l'Ecriture. I'en laisse à dessein beaucoup de choses, pour la crainte que j'ay que quelquefois la haine ait eu plus pouvoir sur eux, que la verité. De la Naissance de l'Herésie. l. 7. c. 8. p. 879.

omitted,

omitted, this foul Disease is one). And *Don Peter* of *St. Romuald*, a Priest and Monk : *As for Theodore Beza*, (says he) *Jerome Bolsec*, and *James Lingey*, all that they have written of *Calvin* is suspected of Flattery, or of too great sharpness against him (f). 'Tis no wonder he should say, that *Beza* is suspected of Flattery ; but doubtless had not *Bolsec's* Calumnies been very broad and ill-colour'd, a *Monk* would never have suspected them.

(f) Car pour Theodore de Beze, Hierosime Bolsec Medicin de Lion, & Jaques Lingey Ecolesois, Docteur

de Sorbonne, tout ce qui ils en ont écrit est suspect de flaterie ou de trop grande aigreur contre luy. Thresl. Cronolog. & Historiq l'an. 150.

2. The Falshood of this Tale will be farther manifest to all Men, by considering, what other Persons, both Protestants and Papists (whose Authority in this matter, at least, is unquestionable) have written concerning *Calvin's* Diseases and Death.

1. For Protestants ; I shall insist only upon *Beza's* History of his Life. He pretending to tell us all his Diseases, makes no mention of this ; besides, that the account he gives of him some days before, and at his Death, is utterly inconsistent with it.

Bolsec says, That from his Ulcers, and from his whole Body issued most noisom Stinks, by which he was loathsom to himself, and his Family ; and that his Domesticks reported, that for this very reason he would not be visited (g).

(g) — Cum ex ulceribus totoque corpore gravissimi

foetores emanarunt, ob quorum graveolentiam & sibi ipsi gravis, & quæ eum circumstabat, familiaris erat. Quam causam fuisse etiam hi ejus Domestici narrarunt, quod visitari se nollet. Vit. Calv. c. 22.

Now *Beza* tells us, That after he had finish'd his Will, viz. April 26. (a Month and one Day before his Death) he signified to the Syndicks, and all the Senators,

tors, that he had a desire to visit them once more in their Senate-House, before he died, and hoped to be carried thither the next Day ; they desired him to consult his Health, and sent him word that they would come to him, which accordingly they did : After he had thanked them for their Favours, and given them much good Advice, he gave to every one of them his right Hand, and dismissed them weeping. *April 28*, at his request all the Ministers within the Jurisdiction of that City came to him, to whom after he had given an Exhortation, he likewise reach'd out his Right Hand to each one in particular, and sent them away with heavy Hearts and wet Eyes. *May 19* (and he died *May 27*) the Ministers being wont on that Day to eat together, a Supper was prepar'd for them at his House, and he being carried to them, from his Bed into the next Room, *I now Brethren* (saith he) *come to take my last Farewell, I shall never more sit at Table.* Before Supper was ended, when he required to be carried back again to his Bed-Chamber, he said with a Smiling Countenance, *This Wall between us will not hinder, but tho absent in Body, I shall be present in Spirit with you.*

I need repeat no more ; If this already said be true, what *Bolsec* says must be false. And that this is true, every one must grant, (considering the time when, and the place where it was publish'd) who grants, that *Beza* was in his Wits ; For he publish'd it presently after *Calvin's* Death at *Geneva*, where, if but one tittle had been false, every Citizen almost must have known it : If the Senators had not all visited him, and the Ministers all met at his House, a few Days before his Death (as *Beza* reports) every one of those Senators, and every one of those Ministers would have given him the Lye,

†

and

and proclaimed him to the World for an impudent Impostor: Especially those who were *Calvin's* Enemies, would have noised it abroad: Whereas not one, either great or small was found, who contradicted one Word of it.

2. But we need not the Testimony of *Beza*, or any other Protestant; the Papists themselves, even those who have written much more than is true to defame him, shall be his Compurgators; For if they take no notice of this Disease, who, could they have found any colour for it, would have made the World ring with it, 'tis certain they took it for a Fable.

Now whosoever will take the pains to peruse the Book quoted in the Margin (*b*), he will find many of these collected to his Hands: But because the Book is not in a Language that every one understands, I shall touch upon two or three of them. *Florimond* when he reckons up his Diseases, gives not the least intimation of this (*i*), *Jaques Desmay* insists vehemently on those Diseases *Calvin* was afflicted with toward the end of his Life, as *Impostumes*, *Hemorrhoids*, *Stone*, *Gout*, in short no less than a dozen, and then insults over him, making them as visible Tokens of God's Vengeance upon him, as his smiting the *Philistins* in the hinder parts, and putting them to a perpetual Shame. Now can it be imagined that he would have omitted this, could he have found the least shew of Truth for it, since this would have stood him in more stead than all the rest? I shall add but one more, *viz. Jaques le Vasseur*, who is so far from forgetting any thing that might be to *Calvin's* disadvantage, that he tells many silly ridiculous Tales on purpose to disgrace him, and yet hath not one word

(*b*) La Defense de Calvin contre l'outrage fait a sa memoire, &c. Par Charles Drelincourt. (*i*) La Naissance de l'Herésie. l. 7. c. 10. p. 888.

of this loathsome Disease, or any thing like it. I think I need say no more to vindicate *Calvin* from this ugly Asperion.

2. But let us now suppose it true, and see what the *Romanists* will get by it. Had indeed this Disease fallen upon *Calvin*, but never upon any Man of the Church of *Rome*, they might then seem to have had something whereof to glory; but if for *one Calvin*, we can name *many* greater Men of the *Roman* Communion who have had this Distemper, they were then ill-advised in objecting this against *Protestants*. I shall at present name three only, an Emperor, a King, and a Pope. The Emperor is *Arnulphus*, the Natural Son of *Charles* the Great (*k*). The King is *Philip II*, King of *Spain* (*l*), a Zealous Persecutor of the Protestants. The Pope is *Clement VII*, (*m*).

(k) —Minutis quippe vermicibus, quos pedunculosis aiunt, vehementer

afflictus spiritum reddidit. Fertur autem, quod praefati vermes adeo scaturirent, ut nullis medicorum curis minui possent. Luitpr. de reb. Imperat. & Reg. l. 1. c. 9.

Arnulphus, autem—ut Dei nutu pediculari morbo brevi consumptus sit. Plat. in vita Formos.

Demum Imperator Arnulphus longa infirmitate tabefactus, nulla arte medicabili poterat adjuvari, qui a pediculis consumeretur. Mart. Polon. l. 4. p. 318.

(l) Herode, le Empereur Arnoul, Fils naturel de Charlemagne, Acastus Fils de Pelias, Calisthines d' Olinthien, Sylla, Clement 7 & Philip 2. Roy de Espagne firent manger des pons. Mr. Chevreau. le Tab de la Fortune. l. 3. c. 5.

—Quos (sc. Abscessus) pravo humore se per totum corpus diffundente, pediculorum tanta eluvio secuta est, ut vix indusio exui, & a quatuor hominibus paulum suspenso in linteo corpore quantum per infirmitatem licebat, a duobus aliis per vices detergi posset. Demum post tertianam febrem hectica semper eum conficiente, & accedentibus ad eam plagosis in manibus & pedibus ulceribus, dysenteria, tenesmo, & hydropfi jam manifesta, & verminante semper illa pediculorum Eluvie, &c. Jacob. Aug. Thuan. Hist. 120.

(m) Mr. Chevreau. ibid.

2. I should now proceed to the other part of the Charge, which is blacker and more frightful, viz. *That Calvin invoking the Devils, died blaspheming and cursing.*
But

But I need not insist upon it, because nothing hath been said to expose the falshood of the former, but what is as truly applicable to this also. If therefore the Reader please to recollect what hath been already deliver'd, he will find this equally confuted by it. Tho I might have added several other convincing Arguments, had I not already exceeded the bounds allotted to this Discourse. But the Truth is, the Calumny is so broad and naked, that it confutes it self.

I think it is now evident enough, that the Church of *Rome* can have no advantage against the Protestants, from the unhappy Deaths of their prime Pastors and Teachers. For, as *Bellarmin* himself pretends but to five such; so I have made it appear, that the Stories he tells of these, are all of them, either plainly false, or impertinent. Happy Protestants! So happy in this respect, that if it might pass for a Note of the true Church, they need desire to be tried by no other. And since *Bellarmin* in the next Chapter, boasts of the miraculous Success of the Papists against Hereticks; I desire them to consider, whether it was not at least next to a Miracle, that *one Luther*, who opposed himself to all the united Forces of the Papacy, should live so long, and at last come to his Grave in Peace. It may (as I said before) seem strange to some that Cardinal *Bellarmin* should abuse the World by such feign'd Stories as he does; but let it be remember'd, that he was a *Jesuit*, and the Wonder will then be the less.

Among all those Princes, and other Secular Powers, who have (under God) been the great Defenders of the Protestant Faith, the Cardinal has told us of no unhap-

py Ends ; we may guess at the Reason, for if he could, we cannot imagine he would have spared them, since these would have been much more to his purpose, than *Pharaoh, Antiochus, Herod, Nero, Domitian, Maximinus, Julian*, and some others, which he has impertinently enough alledged. Tho had he produced many Examples of this sort, *one Queen Elizabeth* would have been enough to have put in the Ballance against them all. Having shew'd how much the Protestants are beholden to *Bellarmin* for this Note,

2. Let us now see whether the Church of *Rome* can make as fair a Claim to it. Or rather, whether she, which will needs be the *only* Church, will not by this Character be unchurch'd. To begin with her Church-Men.

I might insist upon the dismal Ends of *Cardinal Wolsey, Charles Caraffa, Caesar Borgia, Angelot*, and many other Cardinals. But because if any Rank of Men among them be exempted from this sad Fate, we may in reason expect it should be the Bishops of *Rome*, who by their Flatterers are made, not only equal to, but in many things superiour to the Angels, who cannot die ; I shall therefore more especially reflect upon them : For if we find that the Popes themselves, not only *die like Men*, but have had many of them, the most unhappy Deaths, we may safely conclude, that the Church of *Rome* will never be able by this Mark to prove herself the true Church.

We have already heard the unhappy Deaths of Pope *Nicholas III, Paul II, Clemens VI, Leo X, and Clemens VII* ;

VII; to which I shall add a few more, out of many that might be mention'd.

Pope *Clemens* II (*q*), and *Victor* III, (*r*), were poison'd. Pope *John* X (*s*), and *Benedict* VI (*t*), were both strangled in Prison. Pope *John* XXII, when he promis'd himself a long Life, was suddenly crush'd to Death, by the fall of his Bed-Chamber, in his Palace at *Viterbium* (*u*). *John* XII, was smitten (says *Luitprand*) by the Devil, in the very Act of Adultery, and died of the Wound within eight Days (*v*). *Stella* tells us, that he was Stabb'd by the Husband of the Adulteress (*x*). *Martin*, that he died in Adultery suddenly without Repentance (*y*): In this they all agree, that he receiv'd his Death's Wound in the very act of Lewdness; the Devil well rewarded him, for the honour he was wont to do him, in drinking his Health (*z*). Pope *Boniface* VII (*a*), and *Boniface* VIII (*b*), both died as shamefully, as they lived wickedly.

Benedict IX (the Writers of his Life tell us) was seen after Death in a monstrous Likeness; and being asked (after he had told who he was) why he appeared in such a horrid shape? he answered, Because I lived like a Beast, without Law and Reason, it is the Will of God, and of *St. Peter*, that I should bear the shape of a Beast rather than of a Man (*c*). I should not have mention'd this, had I not found it confirm'd by Cardinal *Baronius* (*d*):

(*q*) Plat in Vit.

(*r*) Jo. Stella. p. 160. Mart. Polon. Chron. l. 4. p. 363.

(*s*) Mart. Polon. l. 4. p. 334.

(*t*) Mart. Polon. p. 341.

(*u*) Papir. Masson. fol. 188.

(*v*) Luitprand de Reb Imperat. & Reg. l. 6. c. 11. Quadam nocte extra Romam, dum se cum cujusdam viri uxore oblectaret, in temporibus adeo a Diabolo est percussus, ut intra dierum octo spatium eodem sit vulnere mortuus.

(*x*) Stella ad an. 958. p. 133.

(*y*) Chron. l. 4. p. 353.

(*z*) Luitprand. l. 6. c. 7.

(*a*) Plat. & Stella.

(*b*) Mart. Polon. l. 4. p. 439. Stella. an. 1291. Plat.

(*c*) Plat. Mart. Polon. Stella.

(*d*) Baron. Annal. an. 1054

Who n. 54, 55.

(e) Ibid. n. 56.

(f) Papir.
Misson. l. 6.
fol. 374.
Richer. Hist.
Conc. general.
l. 4. par. 1.
p. 144.

(g) Onuphr.
in vit.

Who also gives the Reasons from *Petrus Damiani*, why he appeared in the compounded shape of a Bear and an Ass; and adds the reason himself, why he appeared by a Mill (e). *Alexander VI*, by the mistake of his Cup-bearer, drank himself that deadly Wine, which he had prepared for the poisoning of his Cardinals, and died forthwith (f). *Paul IV*, went off the Stage with as much Infamy, as his Enemies could desire; scarce was the Breath out of his Body, when the People mad with Fury, ran through the City to destroy whatsoever had been done by him, cursed the Memory of the Pope, and of all *Carafaes* (the Name of the Pope's Family) burnt the new Prison of the Inquisition, he had made for Hereticks—Then running to the Capitol, demolish'd his Marble Statue, drew the Head of it through the Streets of the City, and after many Contumelies threw it into *Tiber*. In fine, an Edict was promulgated, by which all were commanded under the heaviest Penalty, to deface the Arms of the *Caraffian* Family, in what place soever of the City they were found (g). This may I think suffice for Popes.

It were easy to observe several Circumstances, in the Deaths of *Morgan*, *Gardiner*, *Sanders* and others, which Men would be apt to conclude, were special Indications of God's Displeasure against the Cause; but it is needless because the advantage of the Protestants, as to their Church-Men, is already sufficiently manifest.

I might now proceed to Secular Persons, and shew that their advantage is as great, with respect to them. It

†

was

was before observ'd, that the Cardinal has not produc'd so much as one unhappy Death of a Protestant Prince. There has been one indeed, here in *England* since the Cardinal's Death (I mean King *Charles I.*) But what is one, to the many (that might be mention'd) of Popish Princes? In *France* alone within the space of threescore Years, we meet with no fewer than five, immediately succeeding one the other, without so much as one happy Death between, *viz. Hen. II, Francis II, Charles IX, Hen. III, and Hen. IV.* I now leave the Romanists themselves, to make the Conclusion which most naturally follows from the Premises; And for a Conclusion of this Discourse, desire them to observe the difference between *Bellarmin's* Authorities and mine: Whereas what he reports of the unhappy Deaths of Protestants, he has taken it from Papists, and from such Papists who were their most implacable Enemies: I have not said a Word of the unhappy Ends of Cardinals, Popes and Popish Princes, but what I have borrow'd from their own Writers.


T H E E N D.

E R R A T A.

P. Ag. 335. l. 5. for *there* r. *them*. P. 336. l. 22. r. *Diocletian*. P. 344. l. last, for *found* r. *forc'd*. P. 349. Marg. l. 7. for *cenani* r. *cenam*. P. 352. l. 27. for *Physician* r. *Physitian*. P. 354. Marg. for *Vondra* r. *Vondra*, l. 6. for *beaucomp* r. *beaucomp*. P. 358. Marg. l. 13. for *pons* r. *pons*.

L O N D O N,

Printed by *J. D.* for *Richard Chiswell* at the Rose and Crown in
St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1687.



The Fifteenth Note of the CHURCH
 EXAMINED,
 VIZ
 TEMPORAL FELICITY.

Ultima Nota est Felicitas Temporalis, divinitus iis collata qui Ecclesiam defenderunt. Bellarm. de Notis Ecclesiæ. Cap. 18.

I M P R I M A T U R.

August 12. 1687.

Guil. Needham.

WE are now come to the Last of those Notes, by which the Cardinal would perswade us the true Church may be easily known. He had laboured hard to make them up so many; but he was resolved never to leave raising of Notes, till he had his full Complement of Fifteen. And in this he seems to have been put to such a Shift, as some Generals sometimes are; who finding themselves in Streights, draw out their Front to a great Length, and fill up their Ranks with Suttlers Boyes, and other weak Attendants on the Camp, meerly to make a Shew, and amuse the Enemy with a vain appearance of Numbers, when they have reason to dread the Issue of the Battel. It is certain no Man before him ever counted up so many

Bellarmin. de
Not. Eccl. c. 3.

Notes as he has done. Some he tells us make but *Two*, some *Three*, some *Four*, some *Six*, some *Ten* or *Eleven*, as they please, and one, he thinks, reckons up a *Dözen*; which is the most that any ever durst venture upon, till he himself came on the Stage. And then he at last makes a new Discovery, that they were all short in their Account; for that the Notes of the Church are just Fifteen. So that here must be Three at least, purely his own, that were never heard of before; and for which they that like them must stand for ever obliged to Cardinal *Bellarmin's* happy Invention. But then what a miserable Condition was the Church in for many Ages! For if there be no Salvation out of their Church, as they of the *Romish* Persuasion confidently affirm; and if this Church is to be known by certain Notes, as they endeavour to prove; and if these Notes be dubious and arbitrary, and often differing, according to the Fancy of their several Writers, as cannot be denied; then what hopes can there ever be of finding out the true Church, and ending the Controversy this way? And if two or three Notes are sufficient to determine the Matter, as some have thought; to what purpose are we troubled with all the rest? But if the whole Number be judged necessary to make it evident; what a hazardous Estate were Men in, before this great Author had perfected the List? And their danger continued a long time; for they were never acquainted with divers of these Notes, till towards the latter end of the Sixteenth Century.

Ibid.

But the Cardinal himself seems to be sensible of the weakness of many of them, when he acknowledges *That the Moderns commonly assign but Four; and those taken out of the Constantinopolitan Creed, where the Church is declared to be One, Holy, Catholick, and Apostolick. And these alone without the help of any other fictitious*
super-

supernumerary Notes, are abundantly sufficient to demonstrate that any Church, to which they do belong, is not certainly a true Church. And therefore to gain credit to those he has thought fit to add, he tells us they may be *some way reduc'd to these Four*. But for my part, I do not understand how it can possibly be done. And not to mention any of the rest, I will instance only in this last Note I am about to examine. *Temporal Felicity* (which he cautiously restrains to Success in War.) for ought that I can perceive, is not by any means *reduceable* to any of the *Four*. It will not evidence the *Unity* of the Church; for if this Note be allowed, then *Mahomet the Great, Solymán the Magnificent, Gustavus Adolphus*, and divers others were all good Catholicks in their time; and instead of One, we must have as many Churches, as there have been Fortunate and Victorious Princes in the World, that have fought for the propagation, or defence of the most different Religions. Neither is it any better Argument for *Sanctity*; unless to such as can esteem *Gain to be Godliness*, and account *Turks and Saracens* Holy Men. Much less can *Catholicism* be proved from it; since good Success was never known to attend always upon the same side; and the *Catholick Church and Universal Empire*, whatever ambitious Men may dream, are never like to be the same thing. And least of all can we from hence gather any Church to be *Apostolical*. The Primitive Christians were unacquainted with the Glories of Worldly Triumphs. They subdued the Nations, but it was with Spiritual Weapons: They conquered the remotest parts of the Earth; but it was by the Holiness of their Doctrine, the Blamelessness of their Lives, and the greatness of their Sufferings. The *Apostles* did not march out to convert the World with Crosses on their Breasts, and Javelins in their Hands:

One of them once drew a Sword in his Masters Quarrel, but was presently commanded to put it up again, with a severe Commination. So that I do not see to which of the *Four* received Notes this of *Temporal Felicity* can be tolerably reduced. I shall therefore examine it as it stands by it self.

But by the way I cannot but observe how subtilly the Cardinal has endeavoured to secure this Note; which he must needs know was very liable to many material Exceptions. And at once to prevent them all, he tells us roundly, *That Catholick Princes never adhered unto God heartily, but that they most easily triumph'd over their Enemies.* This he very confidently affirms, but without any offer at a Proof: But yet this will furnish him with an Evasion that may be always ready. For whenever any of those Princes, which he calls Catholick, shall be shewn to have been unfortunate in their Adventures; it may be quickly replied, that they did not then *heartily adhere unto God.* And the contrary may be asserted with equal Assurance; and so here is a Controversy started, about a Matter of Fact, which all the Men upon Earth are never able to decide. For the Intentions and inward Dispositions of Mens Minds are discernible to none, but the Searcher of Hearts. And how then can this be pretended to be a Note by which we should know the true Church, when the sole Condition, upon which the Evidence of it is made to depend, is to us altogether impossible to be known.

And this alone might be sufficient to evince the vanity of it; but yet I shall endeavour to make it appear further, by shewing.

I. That *Temporal Felicity* cannot be esteemed a Note of the Church.

II. That

II. That the Instances the Cardinal brings, do not prove it.

III. And that there are many Examples of *Infidels* and *Hereticks*, as he accounts them, who have been as prosperous and successful in the World, as any of his *Catholicks*. If these things may be severally made out, then the Church of *Rome* is like to get but little Advantage by this fifteenth Note.

I. And that *Temporal Felicity* cannot be esteemed a Note of the Church seems evident enough, and that principally for these Reasons :

I. Because God has no where promised it in all the holy Gospel ; and it is no better than vain Arrogance, and a fond kind of Presumption to make that a Mark of the Church, which is neither essential to the Constitution of it, nor yet inseparably annexed to it by virtue of any Divine Promise. The *Jews* indeed were encouraged in their Obedience by the Proposal of many *Temporal* Blessings ; and if they did faithfully and conscientiously observe the Law, they were assur'd of great and miraculous Victories over their Enemies. *Five of you shall chase an hundred, and an hundred of you shall put ten thousand to flight.* But Christianity which is a more Spiritual Religion, that is established upon better Promises, and has more full and express Revelations of everlasting Happiness than they had, has no ground at all to flatter it self with the foolish Hopes of external Felicities and worldly Glories. I cannot find one word in all the New Testament, upon which such an idle Imagination can be probably grounded. Nay, on the contrary, Distress and Afflictions seem to be the most ordinary Portion that our blessed Lord has been pleased to allot the best of his Followers in this Life.

He

Lev. 26. 8.

Joh. 16. 33. He told his Disciples, *In the World ye shall have Tribu-*
 2 Tim. 3. 12. *lation. Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus,*
shall suffer Persecution. The Expressions are plain ;
 and many more might be brought to the same purpose :
 And if they could all be warrantably restrained to
 some certain Persons and Times, yet they would afford
 but a very feeble Argument to prove that *Temporal Fe-*
licity was a Note of the Church ; and if any better
 can be produced, it is more than the Cardinal has done.
 His Error in this is very like that of the Jews, who
 anciently did, and still do expect a Triumphant World-
 ly Kingdom in the days of their *Messias*. But they are
 far the more excusable ; for, as I said, they had some
 Promises of *Temporal Blessings*, and so might have some
 colour for such a Mistake : But it is hard to frame any
 Apology for one, who professes to believe in a Cruci-
 fied Saviour, that shall distinguish his Church by the
 same Character which they did, without the least shew
 of a Promise to support it. It is to be fear'd, when
 he invented this, that his eyes might be something
 dazzled with Purple Robes, and Red Hats ; or his Fan-
 cy intoxicated with the false Glories of extirpating He-
 reticks by force of Arms.

2. But be that as it will ; this Note must fail him
 again, because for several Ages together the Church
 could not pretend to any such thing as *Temporal Feli-*
city. Three hundred years at least, were passed over
 in nothing almost but continual Persecutions. Chri-
 tianity was made the common Object of the Hatred
 and Fury of the People ; and wicked and inhumane
 Princes spent most of their Rage and Cruelty upon
 it. They rack'd their Inventions to find out new and
 exquisit ways of Torture. The Prisons were throng'd
 with Crowds of Confessors, and the Theaters, and
 places

places of publick Execution were sprinkled with the Blood, and strewed with the Ashes of the holy Martyrs. And a long time it was that these lamentable Spectacles were very frequent ; and when they happened to have any little intermission, it was rather a Refreshment, than a Rest ; nothing but a space of taking Breath, that they might gather strength, and prepare themselves for another Encounter. And all this while to be sure the Christians could obtain no other Victory over their Adversaries, but by convincing their Infidelity by their patient suffering. Before *Constantine* shewed them what it was, they were great strangers to *Temporal Felicity* ; and how often they have had it interrupted since that, I will not now enquire : but whatever this may be of the *Roman*, it is not a Note of the true *Catholick* Church ; for that we know flourished divers Ages, in the greatest Purity without it.

3. And if this be not Proof enough, yet the unspeakable Miseries which the Church of God must endure in the Days of *Antichrist*, is an undeniable Demonstration that this Note cannot be allowed. The Cardinal himself confesses, and I think all the Writers of his Communion do generally agree, that the *Antichristian* Tyranny shall far exceed all the Cruelties that were inflicted by the worst of the Heathen Emperours. This others believe as well as they ; but then they conceive that some of these grievous Calamities may be already past in the sharp and lingring Torments, the many dreadful Massacres, and the cruel and promiscuous Slaughters of later times ; which can scarce be parallel'd by any thing the Christians suffered of old under Pagan Idolaters. But *Bellarmino*, and the rest of the Church of *Rome*, for some Reasons do imagine that all this is still to come.

But.

Bell. de Rom.
Pont. l. 3. c. 4.
and 17.
Corn. a Lap. in
Apocal. cap. 3.

But be it past or future, it quite overthrows the credit of this Fifteenth Note. For the State, which by his own Confession the Church must be in during that *Antichristian* Persecution, is very inconsistent with *Temporal Felicity*. There is no stress therefore to be laid upon this; no Promise can be pretended for it, and the time has certainly once been, when it was not, and it is frankly acknowledged that the time shall come again when it will not be a Note of the Church.

II. This might be sufficient to put an end to this Dispute: But because the only way the Cardinal has taken to confirm his Opinion, is by collecting some Historical Passages, which he thinks make for his purpose; I shall briefly examine several of them, and make it appear that the Instances he brings do not prove what he intends.

And as for all those taken out of the Old Testament, they were particular and signal Successes conferred by Almighty God upon his Faithful People, according to some special Promises formerly made them, as I have intimated before; and they might be accounted subsequent signs of their Obedience, but not of their being the true Church; for so they were in all Conditions; as well when they were oppressed by the *Philistines*, as when they drove the *Canaanites* out of the Land; as well in *Babylon*, as in *Palestine*; no less in the midst of their most grievous Afflictions, than in their most prosperous and flourishing Estate. And after *Jeroboam* had made the Separation, the two Tribes were the true Church still, and the Ten were the Schismaticks; notwithstanding the various Events of their Wars, and that the Victory inclined sometimes to the one side, and sometimes to the other.

To what he fays of *Constantine* and *Theodosius*, and some other of the Antients, it might be Reply enough to tell him, that their Successes, supposing his Note to be true, would make nothing to the purpose he contends for: Because, as has been often proved, those Times were not infected with any of those gross Errors which the Modern Church of *Rome* has been guilty of.

But yet to shew what Partiality he uses in the choice of these Instances, I will enquire a little into one of them. He tells us *that a vast Army of the Goths of more than a hundred thousand was totally defeated, in one Battel, and Rhadagaisus their King, together with his Son, taken and slain, and not so much as one of the Romans killed or wounded.* Thus he from *St. Austin* relates it. Others say there was no Battel, but that this huge Multitude of above two hundred thousand Men, or, as some make them, double that number, being inclosed among the barren Mountains of *Fesula*, were so extreemly weakened with Famine; that *Rhadagaisus* endeavoured to make his Escape alone, but being taken Prisoner, was put to Death, and the rest became an easy Prey to their Enemies. This the Cardinal mentions as the *Felicity of Honorius*; and it was indeed a very wonderful Success; but then it is almost the only thing that happened well in all his time. And, notwithstanding this miraculous Victory, he was one of the most unfortunate Emperors of them all. He suffered the Capital City of the World to be taken by *Alaric the Goth*, without ever daring attempt to relieve it; tho the Siege lasted about two years. But he was all that while very wisely diverting himself, and feeding his Poultry at *Ravenna*: And his Mind was so intent upon his Business, that when one of his Officers brought him the News that *Rome was lost*, he had not a Thought of that antient, and formerly glorious

De Civit. Dei.
l. 5. c. 23.
Oros. lib. 7.
cap. 26.
Paul Diacon.
lib. 13.

See Procop.
Vandel. 1.

Procop. ib.

Seat of the Empire, but imagined it had been nothing but a *Cock* he had of the same Name; and was much troubled, and mightily surprized that the poor Bird should be dead so soon, that took Meat out of his Imperial Hand but a very little before. Besides this fatal blow at the Head, that was so lightly regarded, many other Cities and Towns were utterly destroyed, the Country laid wholly waste, such Multitudes of the People most miserably Butchered all *Italy* over, that it was but thinly inhabited for some Ages after, and this and other Incurfions of the Barbarous Nations in those days had so shaken the State of it, that we must begin to date the Ruine of the Western Empire from the Reign of *Honorius*; and he that can produce him for an Example of *Temporal Felicity*, may be fit to believe that 'tis a Note of the Church.

I shall pass over the rest of his Instances, till he comes to the Holy War: And there he takes notice *how the Christians being then about Antioch, with a small number, and those in great despair and a very languishing Condition for want of necessary Provisions, and the Enemy at hand with a potent numerous Army; and when they were in this distress, it was at length seasonably revealed to some Body, where the Holy Lance was, which was brought into the Field in the nick of time and carried before the Souldiers, and three Holy Men appeared in the Clouds fighting for them; and by this means they unexpectedly got an entire Victory, with the slaughter of an hundred thousand of the Turks.* I will not question the Truth of any part of the Story; but let any Man consider the various Successes of that War, and that it was concluded to the advantage of the *Infidels*, who remained Masters of all at last, after so much Blood and Treasure expended, and so many of the bravest Spirits of *Europe* thrown away upon those tedious
and

and fruitless Expeditions; and he will be apt to suspect that here the Cardinal did manifestly prevaricate, and that he had a real design to betray his own Church, and give up the Cause to *Mahomet*.

After this he boasts of a notable Victory over the *Albigenses*; where a hundred thousand of the *Hereticks* were totally routed by his *Catholicks*, that were not the tenth part of their number. It is true the Histories of those times do generally mention a very great Overthrow given those poor People, in a Battel, by a very inconsiderable handful of Men under the Command of *Simon Mountfort*: and that *Peter* King of *Arragon*, who came to their Assistance, was slain on the Place, and *Raymond* Earl of *Thoulouse* forced to fly. And upon this occasion, to strengthen the Cardinal's Argument, as much as is possible, I think it will not be amiss to call to mind some other of their glorious Victories over these *Albigenses*. These we must know were a sort of *Hereticks*, that were spread far and near, and had a long time infected the Church; some say they had continued ever since the days of the Apostles. Pope *Innocent* the Third very desirous to find a Remedy for this Inveterate Evil, appoints divers eminent Preachers to go into the parts where they were thought to be the most numerous, and teach nothing there but the pure Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*; and endeavour by this means to convince them of their supposed Errors. But this way not succeeding; the *Hereticks* remaining obstinate still, notwithstanding the Diligence of the Missionaries; he be-thinks himself of a more effectual Expedient. Since Persuasions will not prevail, he is resolved to try whether Terror and Force may not have a greater Power of Conviction, than Argument. Therefore he publishes a *Crusado* against the *Hereticks*, as had been formerly

See Usher, de
Christ. Eccl.
Success. & Stat.
cap. 10. Sect.
23, 24. &c.

done against the *Infidels* in the East ; and sets forth his *Bull of Plenary Indulgence* to all that should engage in this Sacred *Militia*, and makes them as sure of Heaven, as those were that should be sent on his Errand to the Holy Land. Upon this extraordinary encouragement, great Multitudes flock together from all parts, and full of Zeal and Rage they march on, and perform many notable Exploits to the Eternal Honour of themselves, and him that put them on that pious Work. In one City they put three-score thousand to the Sword, sparing neither Sex nor Age. And when the tender-hearted Souldiers found there were some Catholics in the Place, they desire to know, whether these might not be admitted to Quarter. The Pope's *Legat*, that was attending the Action, commands them to make no Distinction; for fear a *Heretick* might escape under that pretence: And he excuses the Severity of the Order with a Scripture Expression: *The Lord knoweth who are His*. This beginning was enough to strike Terror into all that heard it ; and then they go on valiantly still doing great Execution wherever they come. Whenever any Town, or Castle was surrender'd, it was always upon these Articles; they that would be converted had their Lives; they that refused, were Hanged, or Burnt. After they had proceeded a while in this manner, *Simon Mountfort*, a stout Zealot, is by common consent chosen General of the Pilgrims, (for so they were called) and appointed Commander in chief for this new kind of Holy War ; with a Promise of the Government of what had already been, or should happen hereafter to be taken from the *Hereticks*. He, armed with a sufficient Power, quickly forces *Raimund of Tholouse* out of his Dominions. The poor ejected Prince flies to the great *Lateran Council* for Relief ; they, as if the question had been about a
Matter.

Matter of Faith, suffer the Debate to come before them, and depriving *Raimund*, constitute *Simon E. of Tholouse*. *Raimund* hereupon retires into *Spain*; *Simon's* new Subjects suddenly revolt, and force him to go himself, and send his Wife to several Courts to beg such Supplies as might be sufficient to reduce them to Obedience. But before that could be done, he is crushed to pieces with a great Stone out of an Engine, as he lay before *Tholouse*. Soon after, his Younger Son *Guy* is likewise slain at another Town; *Almaric* the Elder, and Heir to his Father, highly enraged with these Misfortunes that fell so thick upon his Family, swears desperately that he would never remove the Siege till he was Master of the Place. But notwithstanding this insolent Bravado, he is constrained to go away in a Disgrace, aggravated with the Guilt of a presumptuous foolish Oath. Before this, *Raimund* was returned, and entered again upon his Legal Inheritance, and died at last in Possession of it, and left the Succession to his Son; when *Almaric* was fain to wander up and down the World, earnestly entreating all that pleased to pity his Condition, to afford him some Succours, that he might be enabled to endeavour the Recovery of what had been lately usurped by his Father. And now upon a Review of the Successes on both Sides thus far, the *Hereticks* seem clearly to have the Advantage. And for what followed after this, it is an Argument of the particular care the Divine Providence has always had in the preservation of those distressed *Albigenses*; that could never be destroyed by the many potent Combinations that have been made against them, and the violent Persecutions they have endured within these last five hundred Years; but in spite of all the Malice of their Enemies, the Remains of them, at this Day, are enough to exercise the Valour of another

Mount

Mountfort ; if any unhappy Age should chance to produce one.

For his *Catholick* Victories in *Switzerland* and the *Low-Countries*, if the Cardinal had been pleased to acquaint us what they were, perhaps they might be easily ballanced. However, for ought I can learn, the Protestant *Cantons* are in as good Condition as the other. I am sure the Confederate Provinces of the *Netherlands* are grown a very rich and potent Commonwealth, and if they have thrived only by their Losses, then they may plead Miracles in Confirmation of their Religion ; which he makes a Note of the true Church, as well as Success in warlike Adventures.

He just mentions a Victory of *Charles* the fifth over the *Lutherans*, 1547 ; obtained, as he says, by a *Divine Miracle*. I suppose he means at the Battle in *Mulberg*, where the Forces of *John Frederick*, Elector of *Saxony*, were overthrown, and himself taken Prisoner. And I confess, it was a considerable Victory, but I cannot understand the Miracle of it. But grant there were one, yet it must be remembred, that afterwards *Charles* himself was driven out of *Germany* by a *Lutheran* Prince, and forced to clamber over the *Alps* by Torchlight, in a dark and rainy Night, among craggy Rocks, and steep and slippery Mountains, carried in a Horf-litter by reason of his Illness. And when he had with great Labour and Hazzard overcome the Difficulty of the Passage, and was gotten pretty well out of danger, the Fright had made such Impression upon him, that he still conceited *Maurice* was at his heels : Insomuch that when he was met by the *Venetian* Ambassadour, with a Body of Horse, sent by the Senate for the Security of his Person, he was afraid of his own Successors, and could hardly be perswaded that they were

Thuan. lib. 10.

not some of the Enemies Troops. He was indeed a gallant and generous Prince, adorned with many Heroical Vertues, becoming the Greatness of the Character he bore, and had been often crowned with a Success answerable to the Resolution and Bravery of his Mind; but this hasty and lamentable Flight lost him the Fruit, and did something eclipse the Glory of his former Victories, and made him frequently complain of the Change of his Fortune. And being by this and some other Misadventures he met with, made sensible of the Vanity, and grown weary of the Incumbrances of the World, he resigned the Empire, and his other Dominions betwixt Devotion and Discontent, and retired into a Monastery in *Spain*, where he ended his Days. And this I hope might prepare him for an eternal, but it is no part of his *Temporal Felicity*; nor can it ever from hence be prov'd that that of which he professed himself a Member, was therefore the only true Church. Or if it were so, as the Cardinal thinks, when he took *Frederick*; it was certainly otherwise, when he ran away from *Maurice*. And here I might conclude the Examination of this Note, for since he attempts to prove it no other way, but by an Induction of Particulars; if he had failed but in one Instance, as I have shewn he has done in many, the whole Argument could be of no force.

III. But to illustrate and confirm the Matter farther, I shall bring some Examples of *Infidels*, and such as he esteems *Hereticks*, who have been as prosperous and successful in the World, and gained as signal Victories, as any of his *Catholicks*.

When

Cuspinian in
Amurath. 2^o.

When *Uladislaus* King of *Poland* and *Hungary* had concluded a Peace with *Amurath* the second, and solemnly confirmed it with an Oath; *Eugenius* the fourth writes him word that the League being made with the Enemies of the Christian Faith, without his Consent, could not be valid. *Julian* the Legate absolves the King and the rest from the Oath they had taken, and with many specious Pretences perswades them to break with the *Turk*, and enter into an actual War. *Amurath*, who was now withdrawn into *Asia*, hearing what had happened, and being informed of the Preparations that were making against him, returns unexpectedly with a mighty Force, and meets with the Christians not far from *Varna*; where was begun a most bloody and obstinate Fight, which lasted, as they report, for three days with dubious Success. *Amurath* at length upon the Sight of the Picture of our Saviour on the Cross, that was painted in some of the Christian Banners, passionately prays him to avenge the Injury done to his Name by those his faithless Followers who had so lately sworn the League, and so basely and perfidiously broken it, without any Provocation. In the end, the Christians are put to the Rout, *Uladislaus* is slain, the brave *Huniades* hardly escapes, the treacherous Legate, who had drawn them all into this Distress, is found upon the Ground stript and wounded, and ready to expire, many other great Prelates and Nobles are killed on the Place, and a miserable Slaughter made of about thirty thousand of the common Men. A remarkable Instance to shew that Success does not always attend the Papal Benediction.

Fumee Hist.
Hungar. Book

1.

Cuspin. Orat.
Protrept.

The unfortunate Battel of *Mohatz* was almost parallel to this in some Circumstances. For *Solyman* the Turkish Emperour, invading *Hungary* with a potent Army,

Army, *Paul Tomoree*, first a Souldier, afterwards a Monk, and then an Arch-Bishop, is chosen General against him, under *Lewis* the young King. He hastily engages the Enemy, and is utterly defeated, himself slain in the Field, with many more eminent Church-men, and other Persons of the best Quality. His Head is fixed upon a Pole, and carried about the Turkish Army in a scornful and ridiculous kind of Triumph. *Lewis*, a Prince of great Hopes, scarce yet come to the Flower of his Youth, is drowned in a Ditch, and found sticking in the Mudd, above a Month after the Fight. I might add many more the like Successes of the *Turks* and *Saracens* against those that have defended the Church, which the Cardinal esteems the only true One. But I think these two may suffice.

It were not difficult neither to collect numerous Examples of those he calls *Hereticks* who have often put his Catholicks to the worst: I shall name but one, which, for the Multiplicity of good Fortune, may well serve instead of many; and that is *Queen Elizabeth*; whose Memory will always be honourable, when Envy and Detraction have done their utmost. At her coming to the Crown she found her self involved in War with two potent Neighbours, *Scotland* and *France*. She was destitute of Allies abroad, and not secured of the Affections of her People at home. The many and great Revolutions, that had been in Matters of Religion especially, in the three foregoing Reigns, had created such violent Animosities, and so very different Interests in the Nation, that they seemed to threaten her Government with perpetual Faction and Disorder. But all these Difficulties that might be thought insuperable, were happily overcome, or wisely composed; and her long Reign of more than four and forty years,

E e e

passed

See Bacon Re-
positat. p. 131.

passed over with such a constant Series and Tenour of Success, that my Lord Bacon, who was intimately acquainted with the Proceedings of those Times, and admirably well qualified to judge, has left us a particular Treatise of *the Felicities of Queen Elizabeth*. Among these I shall not now number the many Escapes she had out of the Hands of desperate Villains, who frequently attempted to assassinate her sacred Person, but only take notice of some other Conspiracies and Rebellions, and that famous Invasion of Eighty eight.

Girolam. Ca-
ten vita del
Gloriosiss. Papa
Pio 5^o. solo per
remetter la
Religion Ca-
tholica &c. p.
115.
Cambd. Eliz.
An. 1569.

1572.

1584.

The first open Rebellion was begun in the *North*, and carried on by the Earls of *Northumberland* and *Westmoreland*, who having gotten together betwixt four and five, Catena says twelve thousand Men, they declare, *That they took Arms only to restore the Catholick Religion, and the antient Laws of the Realm*. But upon the Approach of seventeen hundred of the Queens Forces, and the Report of more that were to follow, they suddenly disperse, and fly into *Scotland*, where *Northumberland* remaining, is delivered up, and beheaded at *York*; *Westmorland* gets over into *Flanders*, is allowed a small Pension from the King of *Spain*, lives miserably all the rest of his days, and at last dies in Exile.

Cambden. An.
1602.

The many Insurrections in *Ireland*, in which the Cause of the Cardinal's Church was always pretended, which were encouraged by the Pope, and often strengthened with foreign Assistance, were all of them happily suppressed. The last was the longest and most dangerous of all; but a few Months before her Death she received the joyful News of the Defeat and Submission of the Rebels, and so left both her Kingdoms in a settled and peaceable Condition.

But among all the remarkable Successes of that great Queen, the timely Detection of the grand Design against her Life and Government must not be forgotten, tho it never came to the Decision of a Battel. *Pius* the fifth, who was resolved by all means to work her Ruine, in a furious kind of Zeal, which by some is highly commended, by his *Declaratory* Sentence deprives her of all her Dominions, absolves her Subjects from their Allegiance, and puts her and her Adherents under an *Anathema*.

Id. An. 1570.

There was one *Ridolfi* a *Florentine* Gentleman, who had long resided at *London* upon pretence of Trade; to him he sends to prosecute his Business diligently, and stir up all the discontented Spirits of the Kingdom against her; which he did with great Industry, and too much Effect. *Spain* is heartily engaged in the Plot, and the Duke of *Norfolk*, a Person highly favoured by the People, is constituted *Head of the Holy Conspiracy*, as some of them call it. *Pius* is so heartily bent upon the Execution of the Design, that besides large Sums of Money already remitted, he promises, if need were, to pawn all that the Apostolick See was worth, Chalices, Crosses, and the very Cloaths to his Back; nay, to come himself in Person into *England* too: A very unusual Kindness, and such an Honour as never had been done this Nation before. But while the Matter was thus zealously carrying on, and all things in a readiness, and *Philip* and he had swallowed the whole Kingdom in Conceit, on a sudden all their Hopes are most unluckily dashed; the whole Treaty is unexpectedly discovered by an unknown Hand from beyond the Seas; the Duke is taken, and receives the ordinary and just Reward of a Traytor. How his Holiness was affected with this Miscarriage, may be easily guessed; the King of *Spain* lamented it mightily to Cardinal *Alessandrino* the Pope's Nephew; he thought

GiralamoCa-
tena vit. di
Pio. 5^o. p. 113.
&c.
Gabut. de vit.
& rebus Gest.
Pii quinti. l. 3.
cap. 9.

Capo della
Santa conjura.
Calen. Pie
conspiranti-
um. Gabut.

there never was a neater, and better begun Plot in the World; and that the Queen might have been surprized with a few Men from *Flanders*, and the Business gone beyond Recovery, before the News could get into *France*. But the greater, and nearer the Danger was, the greater must her Happiness be that so narrowly escaped it.

Camb. An.
1588.
Grot. Hist. de
reb. Belg. lib. 1.
Thuan lib. 89.
Strada, Dec. 2.
lib. 9.
Bentivoglio
della Guerra
di Fiandra
parte 2. lib. 4.

I will only add to this the wonderful Success of Eighty Eight. The *Spaniards* had all the Advantages imaginable on their side; they exceeded us much both in the Bulk and Number of their Ships, and all manner of Naval Provisions; they prided themselves in the Multitude, Experience and Hardiness of their Souldiers. But yet when their *Invincible Armada*, as they vainly called it, came to be engaged, they are worsted by the *English* in several Encounters, and at length after the loss of many of their principal Vessels of War, and a great slaughter of Men, they are forced to fly, and take their Course through the rough Northern Seas, at a very unseasonable time of the Year, where many more perish by Tempest. And when the poor Remains of this Mighty Fleet were arrived at last shattered and torn on the Coast of *Spain*, many of those that had escaped the fury of the Waves, and the Shot of the Enemy, are taken away by a great Mortality, (occasioned probably, by Grief, or Shame, or the Hardships they endured in this miserable Expedition) almost as soon as they were come a-Shoar; in nothing more fortunate than their Companions, that had been buried in the Ocean, but only that they found a Grave in their own Country. Cardinal *Bentivoglio* having given a full Relation of the whole Matter, reflects very sensibly upon it, and tells us that *there have been few other Designs that were ever longer in the projecting, few carried on with*

Poche altre
imprese furono
mai piu lungamente
premeditate. Phoce
altre con piu
grande apparecchio
disposse; e niuna
forse con inferlicita
maggiore poi eseguite.

greater

greater Preparations, and it may be not any after all more unhappy in the Execution. Historians of all sides are perfectly agreed as to the Event. But those that are unwilling to give the *English* Valour and Conduct any part of its just Commendation, impute the Victory to the Winds and Weather only, and it is readily granted that the *Catholick Armada* suffered very much by them. But that, and the Death of *Sancta Cruz*, and some other Occurrences that might be named, are an undeniable Argument that the Divine Providence appeared visibly for the preservation of the Protestant Religion. For this was looked upon as a Holy War, and many offered themselves to serve in it upon that account. *Sixtus Quintus* then Pope promoted it vigorously, and talked of paying vast Sums of Money towards it; but all the Importunity that could be used, could never persuade him to part with one Farthing by way of Advance. Yet, to shew his Good Will, he assisted very freely in another way. He renewed the Sentence his Predecessours had passed against the Queen, deposed her from her Royal Dignity and Estate, cursed Her, and all that should dare to be obedient unto her, and very kindly gave away all her Dominions at once. And in Prosecution of his noble Designs, he sent Dr. *Allen* a Cardinal's Cap, and intended to make him his Legat here in *England* to settle all, and reconcile the Nation to the Church of *Rome*. These things were so well known, that *Strada* the Jesuit, after a Narrative of this lamentable Overthrow, for fear it should be made use of to the disadvantage of his Catholick Cause, as if Almighty God had manifestly favoured the Hereticks, in the conclusion of all, effectually confutes this last Note of *Belarmin's*.

Neque se ma-
gis pios vendi-
tare poterint
quia fortunati-
ores fuere ;
nisi forte, &c.

larmin's. For when he had intimated what an Unhappiness it was to the Queen and Her Subjects, that they had not the good Luck to be conquered, as the Pope and the Spaniard had most lovingly designed ; he tells us that *the English could not therefore boast they were the more Holy, because they had been the more Fortunate : unless perhaps they should think the Misbelief of the Saracens and Turks were to be preferred before the Christian Religion, because in many successful Engagements, they had often defeated the Forces, which the Christians had with much labour brought together.* To this we willingly agree, and are glad that our Cause does not stand in need of such weak Supports. But then if good Success will not be allowed to make for us, when it is on our Side ; there can be no reason it should be brought as an Argument against us, when it happens to be on Theirs.

After this it would be superfluous to reckon up any more of Queen Elizabeth's Felicities ; he that would undertake to recount them all, must write the History of her Reign. And whoever is acquainted with that, will find it true what Anne D'est Dutcheſs of Guise and Nemours (to whose House the Queen had been no Friend) was wont ingenuously to acknowledg , *That she was the most Glorious and Fortunate Woman that ever swayed a Scepter.* This Testimony which was given her by so great a Person, that could not possibly be suspected of Flattery, is very considerable ; but the Character that was bestowed upon her by King James the First, some time before he succeeded her in the Throne, is greater than this, and more to be valued, because of the Impartiality, and Wisdom of the Royal Author. His Words concerning her are these :

There

There is a LAWFUL QUEEN there [in England] presently reigning, who hath so long with so great Wisdom and Felicity governed her Kingdoms, as (I must in true Sincerity confess) the like hath not been read nor heard, either in our Time, or since the Days of the Roman Emperour Augustus. The Authority of so great and wise a Prince may be enough not only to secure her Memory from the malicious Attempts of envious trifling Pens, but to put the Happiness and Prosperity of her Government out of question. And if *Belarmin's* Note of *Temporal Felicity* might be suffered to take place, her Example alone would be sufficient to prove the Church of *England* the true Church; and the Imputations of Heresy and Schism, which are wont to be urged with so much Clamour, must by Consequence be retorted upon His.

K. James his
Works, p. 147.

But I hope I have shewed that this can be no Note; that if it were, the Instances he has brought do not prove what he would have; and that others, may be pleaded as plausibly for the contrary side. And indeed any that considers it must needs wonder, that the Cardinal's Mind should be so blinded with Worldly Success, and Greatness, or whatever it were, as to cause him in the last Place, where we might have expected his greatest Strength, to put in such a frivolous Note, that may be easily turned a thousand several ways; that will fit the *Alcoran*, as well as the Council of *Trent*; and at best makes his Church altogether as various, and uncertain, as the Fortune of War.

I should here have made an end, but that I have met with a late Writer that undertakes to shew the Use and great Moment of the Notes of the Church, &c. And he tells us, that *Cardinal Bellarmine* (after others) hath, to very good purpose, lent his helping Hand, to shew us the City on a Hill, and hath given us Marks which one would think carry Majesty in their Faces. And a while after he imagines that the Author of the *Discourse concerning the Notes of the Church*, darst not let them pass by us in their Majestick Train, lest his Reader with Saba's Queen should be daz'led at the Glory, transported, as she was, that there was no Life in her. For, says he, they seem to a single, not malignant Eye, even triumphant Notes of the militant Church. And then he leads them out in great State, as he thinks. As first; Let me have leave to reckon them: Ay, with all my Heart; well then: The Name Catholick, how sacred to all those who own any of the three Creeds really and veritably! The Second, its Antiquity: How indubitable, and above all suspicion of Novelty! And so he goes on, and shews them all in good Order, till he comes to the three last, and there he draws the Curtain, as if he were afraid any Body should see their Majestick Faces. To say nothing concerning the Confession of Adversaries, and unhappy Exit of the Churches Enemies. Here are two of the Number, which he does but just give us a little glimpse of, and then pops 'em away presently out of sight. But poor *Temporal Felicity* is served worst of all; it has not the Honour to be so much as named, he has not bestowed one Syllable upon it; though I take it to be as *Triumphant a Note*, as any of the rest. But for all that, it

was

was cunningly done to drop it ; for he could not choofe but be aware that the Hereticks might sometimes pretend to a share of it. Now when he had given us fuch a view of the *Majestick Train*, as he thought fit, he concludes the Paragraph with an artificial *Epiphonema*, adorned with a very Pathetical Ingemination : *These, These are the NOTES, which (like a Bill in Parliament) deserve (what ?) a second. Reading.* *Parturiunt Montes* : O the virtue of *Butler's* Rhetorick ! But really I am afraid that *These, These NOTES, These Triumphant NOTES*, as they are by him drawn up, would be so far from being thought worthy of a *second Reading*, that they would certainly be thrown out of the House. However I have look'd steadily upon them, more than once, as they are represented by him, and as they are laid down in the Cardinal's Original ; and I have not yet been able to discover *the Majesty one would think they carry in their Faces* ; but in my Opinion some of their *Faces* would have been a great deal better, if they had had any Foreheads. I have carefully beheld *their Majestick Train* in its full length, and yet never fell in a Swoon, *with Saba's Queen* ; nay, I have not had so much as the least Qualm of Fear or Admiration upon me ; and my Eyes were so far from being *dazzled* at the Sight, that they were no more affected, than if I had looked on a Piece of Green Silk. But I doubt he will censure them very hardly for it ; and think they are a sort of *malignant* Cavaleerish Eyes. I can't help that : but whatever Eyes they be, since I have been able to hold them open so long against the glaring imaginary Splendor of *These, These Triumphant NOTES*, I will venture to draw out the whole *Train* once

more, and give a little Remark upon every one of them, as they pass by.

1. *The Name of Catholick*: This is a Note which may be easily usurped by every bold Pretender; but till it can be proved that it is joyned with the Profession of the true Faith, the *Name* alone is nothing but an empty and insignificant Sound.

2. *Antiquity*: I shall not here mention the *Antiquity* of some Errors, nor that there were many Churches in the World before there was any at *Rome*; but will freely confess that that had been ancient enough, if it had preserved that Doctrine in its Purity, which it received at the first. But it is well known, that the Additions she has made unto that concerning Infallibility, Images, Purgatory, and the like, cannot be pretended to be of Antient and Apostolical Tradition. Nay many of their present Tenents were never declared necessary till the last Age; and the Church of *Rome*, as it is now constituted, can be esteemed no older than the Council of *Trent*; that is, about forty Years younger than the Reformation.

3. *Duration*: By this the Cardinal would persuade us, that his true Church has been from the Beginning, and shall continue to the End of Christianity: The first we deny; the second can never be proved till the Day of Judgment. We are sure the Church of *Rome* has been changed already from what it was; and we hope and believe that it will be changed again from what it is. And then what would
become

become of the *Duration* they boast of, if they should ever reform themselves from those Errors and Abuses which have crept in among them; as has been often attempted, and a long time most earnestly desired by many of the best and most impartial of their own Communion? So that granting this to be a Note, it would make against them both ways. For what is past, we know what Alterations have been made by them; and they can never be secured against others that may happen hereafter.

4. *Amplitude, or Multitude and Variety of Believers.* This can by no means be made a Note of the Church; for the time was once that Christ's Flock was a *little Flock*; and the number of the *Names together were but about an hundred and twenty.* Acts 1. 15. And afterwards the Arrian Heresy had almost overspread the Face of Christendom; insomuch that the whole World was thought to be against *Athanasius*, and *Athanasius* against the whole World. Or should we let it pass for a Note, they could gain but little by it. For they are infinitely exceeded in *Multitude*, not only by *Heathens* and *Mahometans*, but by Christians of other Denominations.

5. *Succession of Bishops.* How far this may be necessary to the Being of a Church, I need not dispute. But the uninterrupted *Succession* they of *Rome* are wont to glory in, is manifestly false: For besides the long Vacances that have sometimes happened, and the many Schisms they have had, when two or more have pretended to the Papacy, and no

Man could determine who had the Right, which must make it dubious; the confessed Hereticks that have possessed themselves of the Infallible Chair, must quite cut off, at least interrupt the *Succession*. Or if they have it, notwithstanding this, or any other Objection that might be made. We of the Church of *England* can plead the same.

6. *Agreement in Doctrine with the Primitive Church.* This is a good Note indeed, if they mean the truly *Primitive Church*; for that *agreed* with the Scripture and *Doctrine* of the Apostles. But then I hope they will not have the Confidence to affirm that their Prayers in an Unknown Tongue, their Half-Communion, their Adoration of the Host, and many other things which they now receive, are agreeable to the Practice and Belief of that *Primitive Church*.

7. *The Union of the Members among themselves, and with the Head.* Of this they are continually making their Brags; but the many and violent Contentions that have often been betwixt the several Pretenders to the Papal Dignity: and the endless Feuds and Animosities that are kept up amongst them about many Controverted Points, do sufficiently declare that their Church has been rent and torn with Factions and Intestine Divisions, as much as any other Society. Or if they were as firmly *United*, as they pretend, it is no more than other Combinations of Men have been in known and wicked Errors.

8. *San-*

8. *Sanctity of Doctrine*: For they generally assert, as the Cardinal does here, that the *Roman Church* maintains nothing that is False, either in Matter of Faith, or Manners. If they were able to prove this, there might be some Reason indeed that their Church should be esteemed the *Mother and Mistress of all Churches*, as she has been wont, of late, to stile her self. But since the Power of deposing Princes has been openly assumed, and frequently practised, and never yet condemned by any either Pope or Council; since the Doctrine of *Æquivocation*, and many other absurd and impious Opinions, are taught by their Casuists, and made use of by their Confessors, in directing the Consciences of their Penitents; and since these, and many more very dangerous Errors, do not only escape without a Censure, but are approved of, and encouraged by their Governours; I do not see how they, and their Church can possibly be excused from the Guilt of them.

9. *The Efficacy of Doctrine*. Here we are told of the wonderful Success they have had in the Propagation of their Faith, and the Conversions that have been made of whole Nations. And supposing it were as they say; yet Heresy and Infidelity has often had as great, and swift a Progress in the World, as any that their *Doctrine* can boast of; and considering the Pravity and Corruption of Human Nature, it is not strange, that the most gross and pernicious Errors should be more readily received, and spread themselves faster, than the most divine, and sacred Truths.

10. *Holiness of Life.* This is indeed the most real Commendation of a Christian; and I will not go about to rob them of the Glory of it. But then it cannot be denied, but meer Philosophers, and some of the Antient, and many of those whom they account Modern Hereticks, have been of a very strict and unblamable Conversation; and divers of their Popes, and other Ecclesiasticks of the greatest Eminency of Place, have been very infamous for all sorts of Wickedness, and Debauchery; and their very Religious Orders have been often complained of, for the neglect of their Discipline, and looseness of their Lives; as is abundantly testified by their own Authors.

Mat. 24. 24.

11. *The Glory of Miracles.* These alone were never a Note of the true Church. And those extraordinary Gifts which were bestowed at first, for the Confirmation of Christianity, we think they are ceased long ago. But we are forewarned of *False Christs, and false Prophets, which should shew great Signs and Wonders*; which me-thinks should make a Church very careful how they made any pretension to *Miracles*. But the Church of Rome is resolved to do it, and would fain persuade us that there are many great Ones wrought among them to this very Day, and, as they believe, always will be. But we know, and they will not deny it, that many of the *Miracles*, they have talked of, are meer Forgeries, and Delusions; others altogether incredible, and but weakly attested, and wholly unworthy of the Seriousness and Gravity of the Christian Religion; most

most of them said to be done in Corners, and are never to be seen, but among themselves: When they please to oblige us Protestants, with the sight of a few of them, they may then deserve to be farther considered; till that be done, they must give us leave to think, that their Church is reduced to great Streights, when it shall stand in need of such slight Artifices, as these, to support it.

12. *The Light of Prophecy.* This, if they had it, can bring no more Advantage to their Cause, than the other. The Church of God anciently, when extraordinary Revelations were more common, had not always Prophets in it. And when any appeared, the Prophet was to be tryed by the Faith of the Church, and not the Church by the Predictions of the Prophet. And we are still commanded to *try the Spirits whether they are of God: Because many* ^{1 Joh. 4. 1.} *false Prophets are gone out into the World.*

13. *The Confession of Adversaries:* This, if the Cardinal's Instances were pertinent, would yet be but of little Consequence; for if some Protestants have spoken favourably of his Catholicks, some of his Catholicks have spoken favourably of Protestants. Or if we should be willing to hope well of some of them, as we are; and they should adjudge us every one to Eternal Damnation, as they generally do; this would be but an ill sign that their Church must therefore be the truer, because it is more Censorious, and Uncharitable than Ours.

14. *The*

Ecc. 9. 2.

14. *The Unhappy End of the Church's Enemies*: A wise Man would be something afraid of passing this into a Note, before he was himself safe in his Grave. *For all things come alike to all: there is one Event to the Righteous, and to the Wicked.* Many of the most Zealous Patrons of the Romish Persuasion, have met with as Tragical and Unfortunate Ends, as the most accursed Heretick that ever was devoured by Vermin, or burnt at a Stake.

15. *Temporal Felicity.* This may be placed in the same Rank with the former; it is altogether as variable, and inconstant as that; no certain Judgment can be made upon it. They are not to learn that the Enemies of their Church have been often successful: and that Victory has not always waited upon their Catholick Arms; no, not in their most Holy Wars; when Religion has been the only ground of the Quarrel.

Thus upon a Review of all the Notes in order, as they are mustered up by the great Cardinal, it may appear to any unprejudiced Enquirer, that he has missed of his Aim: For that they are either no Notes of a Church at all, or not proper to that of *Rome*.

And now after the highest Pretences of an Infalible Church, and the absolute Deference and Submission which they say is due unto it, any Man, that shall seriously consider the Matter, must needs wonder, they should have no surer means at last to find

find it out, than a few slight and improbable, nay some of them very vain, false, and extravagant Conjectures. The Protestants, whom they will not allow to be certain of any thing, have far better Evidences than these, and as good Assurances of the Truth of their Church as can be desired. For we think the True Faith, True Worship, and a Right Administration of the Sacraments do unquestionably make a True Church. These the *Romanists* themselves cannot deny to be the great and necessary Notes; and if the Controversy betwixt us come to be determined by these, it will soon appear which Communion we ought to prefer.

We make Profession of the whole Catholick Apostolick Faith, as it is contained in the Holy Scriptures, and briefly comprized in the three Creeds; which is all that was ever received in the Primitive Church: They have made large Additions to the Antient Belief, and increased the number of the Articles from Twelve to Four and Twenty; many of which were not so much as heard of in the First Ages, and never made necessary to be believed, till above fifteen hundred Years after the Publication of the Gospel.

We Worship Almighty God, and none but him; and unto him we Pray in a Language we understand, through Jesus Christ our only Mediator, in whose Name when we ask, we are sure to be heard: They have a kind of Worship which they give to Saints and Images, which as to all External Acts of Adoration, is the very same they pay to God

G g

him-

himself; and when their Addressees are directed un-
to Him, all their Publick Service is in an unknown
Tongue; and they set up to themselves many Me-
diatours of Intercession, when they cannot tell whe-
ther they hear them; but it is most certain that
God has never promised to hear them for their
Sakes.

We receive the two Sacraments which Christ or-
dained in his Church, and administer them both in
such Manner and Form as he has appointed: They
without any Divine Authority, have made Seven
Sacraments; and in the Lord's Supper they believe
that there is offered up a proper Propitiatory Sacri-
fice for the Living and the Dead; they adore the
Elements which they think are Transubstantiated
into the Body and Blood of our Saviour; and suf-
fer the Laity to communicate but in one kind;
robbing them of the Cup, contrary to the plain
Institution, and express Command of our Blessed
Lord.

And since we have the True Faith, True Wor-
ship, and the Sacraments rightly Administred, it is
evident that we are not deficient in any thing that
is necessary to the Constitution of a True Church.
But They will never be able to prove themselves
such a One, by the late Additions they have made
to the Creed, and their many Deviations from the
Primitive Rule. And yet they will be continually
vaunting that they are not only a True Church,
but the only True Church in the World; and up-
on this Presumption they thunder out their Ana-
thema's

thema's upon all Christendom besides, and confidently condemn them for a Company of Heretical and Schismatical Conventicles. But they cannot justify that rash and uncharitable Sentence, nor make good any part of this heavy Charge. For we that heartily believe all the Antient Creeds, cannot be accused of Herefy; neither are we guilty of Schism, because we only Reformed those Errors and Corruptions which they had introduced, and wanted not sufficient Authority for what was done. But if they are still absolutely resolved to stand to the Censure they have passed, and allow no True Church upon Earth, but their Own; it is not Cardinal *Bellarmin's* Fifteen Notes that will ever prove it.

F I N I S.

E R R A T A.

Pag. 367. l. 3. for *not r. most*. P. 371. Marg. l. ult. for *cap. 3. r. 13.*

L O N D O N,

Printed by *J. D.* for *Richard Gbifwell* at the Rose and Crown in
St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1687.

BOOKS lately printed for *Richard Chiswell.*

THE Pillar and Ground of Truth. A Treatise shewing that the *Roman Church* falsely claims to be *That Church*, and the Pillar of *That Truth* mentioned by *St. Paul* in his First Epistle to *Timothy*. Chap. 3. Vers. 15. 4°.

The Peoples Right to read the Holy Scripture Asserted. 4°.

A Short Summary of the Principal Controversies between the Church of *England* and the Church of *Rome*; being a Vindication of several Protestant Doctrines, in Answer to a Late Pamphlet, Intituled, [*Protestancy destitute of Scripture Proofs.*] 4°.

Two Discourses; of Purgatory, and Prayers for the Dead.

An Answer to a late Pamphlet, Intituled [The Judgment and Doctrine of the Clergy of the Church of *England*, concerning one Special Branch of the King's Prerogative, viz. *In dispensing with the Penal Laws.*] 4°.

A PRIVATE PRAYER to be used in Difficult Times.
8°.

A
VINDICATION
OF THE
BRIEF DISCOURSE

Concerning the

Notes of the Church.

In Answer to a Late PAMPHLET,
ENTITLED,
The Use and Great Moment of the Notes of the
Church, as delivered by Cardinal BELLARMIN,
De Notis Ecclesiae, Justified.

I M P R I M A T U R,

Aug. 11.
1687.

Guil. Needham.

L O N D O N ;

Printed for Richard Chiswell, at the Rose and Crown
in St. Paul's Church-yard, MDCLXXXVII.

A VINDICATION of the Brief Discourse concerning the Notes of the Church.

WHEN we are almost tired with grave and serious Disputes, it is very comfortable to meet with a pleasant and diverting Adversary, who serves instead of a *Prævaricator*, or *Terræ Filius*, to refresh and recruit our Spirits with a Scene of Mirth. And though this *Justifier* of *Bellarmin's* Notes looks very demurely, and argues very Logically, and seems to be in very good Earnest, yet a *Merry Andrew* will be a *Merry Andrew* still, though he be dressed up in the Habit of a Philosopher; and therefore I must beg my Readers Pardon, if I cannot forbear Smiling sometimes, though to pay due respect to my Adversary, and to maintain a just Decorum, I will do it very gravely too.

He begins very movingly. *The World is come to a fine pass, when it shall as good as deny Christ's One Holy Catholick Church.* The Use and great Moment of Notes, p. 1. This is very wicked indeed! But who are these Miscreants, that dare do such a Thing? A Company of Senseless Wretches, who deny Christ's Church, and yet confess, *that there is no remission of Sins, or Eternal Salvation out of it.* Then I suppose, they are Men, who don't care much for Salvation, nor Sence: for to deny a Church, out of

which they confess there is no Salvation, is to resolve to be damned; and to say, that Salvation is not to be had out of the Church, and yet that Christ has no such Church, deserves Damnation, as much as Non-sense does. And therefore I suppose by *as good* he does not mean, that they altogether deny it, but do something *as good*, or rather as bad as that; but what this should be, I cannot guess, unless it be to deny the *Roman-Catholick Church* to be this *One Holy Catholick Church* of Christ, and that indeed is a very sad thing too. And *they seek to baffle those, who by Prayer and Guidance of God's good Spirit, search to find it out*, i. e. they confute Bellarmin's Notes of a Church, and that must be confessed to be a very sad thing also, and *as good as denying Christ's One Holy Catholick Church*.

Well! *Cardinal Bellarmin (after others) hath to very good purpose lent his helping Hand, to shew us the City built on a Hill*. But it had been better he had lent us his Eyes; for Protestants see with their Eyes, and not with their Hands; and notwithstanding his pointing to it, we cannot see what he would shew us, unless it be the Church built on Seven Hills.

Page. 2.

But this is all *to little purpose with the Obstinate, who will not agree, neither what the Church is, no nor what a Note may be*. This is unpardonable Obstinacy, that we desire the Cardinal or any one for him, first to tell us, what a true Church is, before he tells us, which is the true Church, to explain the Nature before he gives us the External Notes and Marks of a Church, which is as unreasonable as to ask, what a *Hind*, and a *Panther* is, before we ask, of what Colour they are, whether White or Spotted:
and

and who would think any one should be so perverse, as to ask what a Note is, which our Author will give us a learned Definition of presently.

The Discourser had said, *pag. 3.* That a Church is a Society of Christians united under Christian Pastors for the Worship of Christ, and wherever we find such a Society as this, there is a Christian Church, and all such particular or national Churches all the World over, make up the whole Christian Church, or the Universal Church of Christ. That is (says the Justifier, *pag. 2.*) whatsoever therefore is the Denomination of Believers, Abassine or Armenian, Greek, Roman, let us add, Lutheran, Calvinist, with a wide, &c. they are each of them Churches of Christ (suppose this, of which more presently, and if we allow the Roman, they may modestly allow all the rest) and the Church Universal is nothing else but the Aggregate, or *omnium gatherum* (very elegantly!) of all such Professions. And what then? The Church Universal is made up of all particular Churches. What then do you say? Why pray, consider, whoever thou art, good Reader, the Church Catholick consisting of all Nations, Jew and Gentile, and therefore primarily called Catholick, (and therefore not from their Union to the Bishop of Rome, as the Head of Catholick Unity) had its Plantation by our blessed Lord and his Apostles, in one Faith, and one Communion, antecedently to all such Divisions that now or then were made by the Craft and Policy of Satan. A notable Observation this! That the Faith and Communion of the Church was one, before it was divided: What then? And therefore far is the Universal Church from being an Aggregate of all such Breaches of Faith and Charity. An Aggregate of Breaches, an Union of Divisions may possibly be as good a Church

as it is sense. But though *Breaches* cannot very well be *aggregated*, it is possible that two divided Churches may both belong to the one Body of Christ, as quarrelling Brethren may still be the Children of the same Father, and owned by him too, though corrected and punished for their Quarrels. Churches consist of Men, who are liable to Mistakes and Passions, and therefore may quarrel and separate from each other, while they are both united to Christ in Faith and Worship. For though the Bishops, and Pastors, and Members, of distinct and coordinate Churches ought to maintain a Brotherly Correspondence, and exercise all Acts of Communion, that distant Churches are capable of with each other; upon account of that common Relation they all have to Christ, in whom they are united into one Body; and our common Head will exact a severe Account of those who cause Divisions; yet if such Divisions happen, as separate us from each other, but do not divide us from Christ, each Church may continue a true Church still, and belong to the one Mystical Body of Christ, though there may be some scandalous Breaches and Divisions among them. What is it then that unites any Church to Christ but the true Faith and Worship of Christ? And if contending Churches may both retain the true Christian Faith and Worship, at least in such a degree, as not to be unchurched, the external Peace of the Church is broken, which is a very great Crime, and will fall heavy upon the Authors of it, yet if they both belong to Christ, this *Aggregate of Breaches*, and *omnium gatherum of Professions*, as our Author very wittily speaks, may be united in Christ's Mystical Body. For though they sling one another out of the Church, our common

Saviour

Saviour may chastise their Follies, but own them both, as in such a divided State of Christendom, we have great reason to hope he will.

But let us hear what our Author says is the Catholick Church. *'Tis only a Comprehension of all those Churches which keep to the Unity of the Faith, and persist in their first undivided Estate in the Bond of Universal Peace.* By the *Unity of the Faith*, I hope he means, that one Faith, in which, as he tells us, Christ and his Apostles planted the Church; and then I doubt this will fall hard upon the Church of *Rome*, which rejects all other Churches, who do retain this One Apostolick Faith, if they disown the new Articles of the *Trent Creed*: and the *first undivided Estate* of the Church was settled in an Equality and Brotherly Association of Bishops and Churches, not in the Empire of one over all the rest, and then this is more severe upon the Church of *Rome*, than Protestants desire; for she has destroyed this first undivided State by challenging such a Supremacy, as enslaves all other Churches to her, and therefore is so far from being the One Catholick Church, that if this Definition be true, she is no part of it. And as for *the Bond of Universal Peace*, what Claim she can lay to that, let the cruel Persecutions of those innocent Christians, whom she calls Hereticks, the Excommunication of whole Churches, the deposing of Princes, and all the Blood, that has been shed in Christendom under the Banners of Holy Church, witness for her.

And thus we come to the *Notion of a Note or Mark*, which he says *is clear by its Definition*, page 3. and therefore I hope he will give us such a Definition, as is self-evident, or which all Mankind agree in;
for

for a Definition, which the contending Parties do not agree in, can clear nothing. Let us then hear his Definition: *That it is a most sensible Appearance in or about the Subject enquired after, whereby we are led toward the Knowledge of the present Existence or Essence of the said Subject.* And from hence he concludes; *'Tis manifest then, that a Note of a Thing must be extra-essential of it self, because by it, and the Light from thence, we arrive to the Knowledge of the Essence.* And he adds, *upon which Grounds you see the reasonable Demands of those, who challenge, first, That a distinctive Mark or Note must be more known than the Thing notified. Secondly, That a Note must be in Conjunction at least, in some measure proper, not common or indifferent to many singulars, much less to contraries.*

Now all that I can pick out of this, is, 1. That the Existence or Essence of things must be known by Notes. 2. That such Notes whereby we discover the Existence or Essence of things must be *extra-essential*, or not belong to the Essence of it. And yet, 3. That these Notes must not be common, but proper to the thing, of which it is a Note. Which are as pretty Notions as a Man shall ordinarily meet with, and therefore I shall briefly examine them.

First, That the Existence or Essence of things must be known by Notes. For if the Existence and Essence of things may be known without Notes, this Dispute about Notes is to no purpose. And yet how many things are there, whose Existence and Essence are known without Notes? Who desires any Note to know the Sun by? to know what Light, or Taste, or Sounds, Pain, or Pleasure is? The Presence of these

these Objects, and the notice our Senses give us of them, that is, the things themselves are the only Notes of themselves. The use of Signs or Notes, is only to discover the Existence of such things, as are absent, visible, or future; but what is present and visible, exposed to the notice of Sense or Reason, is best known by itself, and can be rightly known no other way: and therefore since all the dispute is about Marks of the Church, he ought to prove, that the Church is such a Society as can be known only by Notes, and then it must either be absent, invisible, or future; for all other things may be known by themselves without Notes.

Secondly, Especially since he will allow nothing to be a Note but what is extra-essential, or does not belong to the essence of the thing; which seems to me a very extraordinary way of finding out the Existence or Essence of things by such Notes as do not belong to their Essence; and then I think they cannot prove their Existence. For how can I find out any thing, without knowing in some measure what it is I find? or, how can I know what the Essence of any thing is by such Notes as are not essential? There are but two sorts of Notes, or Signs, that I know of, natural, or instituted; and they both suppose that we know the thing, and the Note and Sign of it, before we can find it out by Signs or Notes. As for Natural Signs, the most certain Signs we have are Causes and Effects, but we must know both the Causes and Effects, before the one can be a Sign of the other. Thus Smoke is a Sign of Fire, but it is no Sign of Fire to any Man, who does not know what
B Fire

Fire is, and that it will cause a Smoak, when it seizes on combustible Matter, and that nothing else can cause a Smoak but Fire. Thus in univocal Effects, the Effect declares the Nature of the Cause; as we know, that a Man had a Man to his Father, but then we must first know what a Man is, and that a Man begets in his own Likeness. But this I suppose is not our Author's meaning, that the Notes of the Church are Natural Causes and Effects, or Natural Concomitants or Adjuncts, because the Church is not a Natural, but a Mystical Body, and therefore can have no Natural Notes.

Let us then consider instituted Signs, and they we grant must be extra-essential; but then there never was, and never can be an instituted Sign to discover the Essence and Existence of what we did not know before: The Use of such Signs is to distinguish Places or Persons, by different Names, or Habits, or Colours, &c. or to serve instead of Words, as the Sound of the Trumpet, or the Beat of the Drum, or to be for Legal Contracts and Securities, and the like; but instituted Signs are no Signs till we know the thing of which they are Signs; which shews how ridiculous it is to talk of such extra-essential Notes, as shall discover the Existence and Essence of things, which we knew not before; for if we must first know the Church, before we can find it out by Notes, these extra-essential Notes may be spared. To be sure this shews how far this Definition of a Note is from being clear, since it does not suit any kind of Notes which Mankind are acquainted with; and if the Notes of the Church are a peculiar sort of Notes by themselves, he should

not

not have appealed to the common Notion and Definition of Signs and Notes, because there are no other Notes like them.

Thirdly, He adds, that these Notes must not be common to other things, but proper to the thing of which it is a Note. Now I defie him to shew any such extra-essential Notes in Nature, which are not common to other things; for what in Logick we call *Propria*, do immediately result from the Nature of things, and therefore are not extra-essential Notes, nay are no Notes at all to find out the Essence or Existence of things by, for we must first know what the Nature and Essence of things is, before we can know their essential Properties; and as for inseparable Accidents, how inseparable soever they are from such a thing, yet they may be common to other things, and then by his own Rule cannot be Notes.

But this is not the Case, as I observed before, for the Church is not a Natural, but a Mystical Body, and therefore its Nature depends upon its Institution; and though in Natural Beings we may distinguish between the Essence and the essential Properties, yet where Institution alone is Nature, whatever is made proper, necessary, and inseparable by Institution, is of the Nature of it; and there is no Distinction that I know of between the Essence and essential Properties. In natural Beings we call that the Nature, and Form, and Essence of the thing, by which every thing is what it is, and without which it would cease to be that kind of Being, which now it is, as Rationality is of the Essence

of a Man, for Man is a reasonable Creature, and without a Principle of Reason he cannot be a Man. Now in allusion to Natural Beings, we apply the same Terms to matters of Institution, and call that the Nature and Essence of a Church, without which according to the Laws of its Institution it would not be a Church. And therefore whatever by Institution is so proper, peculiar to, and inseparable from a Church, that without it, it cannot be a Church, is of the Nature and Essence of the Church, and not an extra-essential Property, which indeed is Non-sence. The observing this one distinction between Nature and Institution, will confound this whole Doctrine of the Notes of the Church. For,

1. There can be no Notes of an Institution but the Institution it self: Notes must signify either by Nature or Institution: There can be no Natural Notes of an Institution, which is not the Effect of Nature, but of the Divine Will; and therefore if there be any, they must be instituted Notes, that is, the Institution of the Church must be the Mark or Note, whereby to know it; unless we will say, that there must be a second Institution to be the Notes of the first, and by the same Reason there must be a third to be the Notes of the second, and there will be no place to stop at, unless we stop at the first Institution, which needs no other Notes to prove it self by.

2. That in matters of Institution there is no distinction between Nature and Properties. In natural Beings indeed there is a Distinction between the Nature

ture

ture and Properties of things, because there are some Properties, which by a natural Causality spring from Nature, as Visibilty from Rationality. But now in Matters of Institution one part of the Institution is not the natural Cause of the other, but the whole Institution and every part of it immediately depends upon the Will and Pleasure of God : and therefore there can be no extra-essential Properties of a Church, but whatever is proper and inseparable by a Divine Institution, is the Essence of the Church ; for it has no other Nature and Essence but its Institution.

3. Hence it evidently follows, that there can be no extra-essential Notes of a Church ; that nothing can be a Note of a Church, but what is essential to it by Institution ; for whatever Institution makes proper and necessary, it makes essential. I confess, this is a very improper way of speaking, to call the Nature and Essence of any thing the Note of it ; for a Note or Sign ought to be different and distinct from the thing shown or signified by it ; and thus we ought roundly to deny, that there are any Notes of a Church, or that the Church can be found out by Notes ; but the Protestants in compliance with the Popish way of speaking, called that the Notes of the Church, which is not properly Notes and Signs, but the Rule and Standard of the Church, by which all Societies of Men, which pretend to be Christian Churches, are to be tried. And it is certain there can be no other Rule or Standard of the Church, but its Institution, as to Faith, and Worship, and Government. Common sense will tell us that there is no way to try an instituted Society, but by the Rules

Rules of its Institution : That Church which conforms to the original Rule and Standard of its Institution, is a true Church, and every Church is more or less corrupt, as it varies from it : And here we ought to fix the Controversy, that the Church is not to be found out by Notes, but to be tried by the Rule of its Institution ; and then farewell to Cardinal *Bellarmin's* Notes, which, I believe, he himself, though a Jesuit, would not have had Confidence to say, that they belonged to the Institution of a Church.

In the next Place he says, *I have reckoned up the Cardinal's Notes, now here, now there, piece-meal, but durst not let them pass by in their Majestick Train, lest the Reader with Saba's Queen should be dazzl'd at the Glory, transported as she was, that there was no Life in her.* If Rhetorick would do the Business, we were certainly undone, and should have no more Life left than the Queen of *Sheba* : But the truth is, the Cardinal's Notes may possibly lose something of their Majesty when they are shown by Hereticks, and there is no help for that : but as for their *Train*, to supply the Defects of the Discourser, they have been since shewn in very good Order, and we live still : But whether they be *Triumphant Notes* still of the *Church-militant*, as he calls them, is somewhat doubtful ; and indeed it seems somewhat unreasonable that the Notes should be triumphant, while the Church is militant ; tho' triumph it seems they do over some slavish and servile Minds ; but their Triumph would be very short, were not the Church so *militant* as it is.

But

But as if there were some Charm in this *Majestick Train*, nothing will serve him, but to reckon them up in their Order; and I must confess, he has given such a new Grace and Majesty to them, that I believe *Bellarmin* himself could not know them again.

1st. *The Name Catholick how sacred to all those, who own any of the Three Creeds, really and veritably!* O, how sacred indeed! for Hereticks themselves own and challenge the Name.

2^{dly}. *Its Antiquity, how indubitable, and above all suspicion of Novelty.* Yes, yes! Antiquity is not Novelty, but a pretence to Antiquity may: for how old is the Council of *Trent*? which is the true Antiquity of many Popish Articles of Faith.

3^{dly}. *Perpetual Duration, out-lasting all earthly Empires and Kingdoms.* For it plucks them down as fast as it can.

4^{thly}. *Amplitude; being a great Body according to Prophecy.* But not so big as Paganism yet.

5^{thly}. *Succession Apostolical, the very Jews confessing it; as they do Transubstantiation. How strong, invincible, clear, and undeniable by Gainsayers!* Then I suppose it has no Gain-sayers, if they do not deny it.

6^{thly}. *Primitive consent, how great and how manifest to those good Men, who enquire!* Yea, how great indeed! for no Body can find it but the Vicar of *Putney*. *Witness the Multitudes that return to the Catholick Church upon that account.* Monsieur de *Meaux's* French Converts, I suppose, who never heard of the Dragoons.

7^{thly}. *Intimate Union with their Head Christ, and with one another:* But *Bellarmin's* visible Head of Unity is the Pope, not Christ; so that this is a new Note, and it seems the Churches Union with
Christ.

Christ is extra-essential also, or else it could be no Note.

8thly. *Sanctity of Doctrine, as revealed by God, in whom is Light, and no Darkness at all.* In teaching Men to break Faith with Hereticks; to depose Heretical Princes, and absolve their Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance, and arm them against their Leige Lord; to prefer the Cælibacy of Priests (tho the manifest Cause of so many Adulteries and Fornications) as a more Holy State than Matrimony; and such like Doctrines, wherein is Darkness, but no Light at all.

9thly. *Efficacy upon Infidels.* Witneis the *Spanish* Converts in the *Golden Indies*. But why not upon Hereticks as well as Infidels? I fear the Conversions in *England* are so slow, that he dares not yet make that a Mark of the Church.

10thly. *The Holiness of the Fathers.* Whose Lives we wish to be Legends, (though unquestionably true) when we see, how far they have out-done us. Ay! that makes Hereticks call them Legends.

11thly. *The Glory of Miracles, which a Man would be wary of contradictting for fear of Blasphemy and sinning against the Holy Ghost:* Especially when they are such Miracles as no Body ever saw, but the Monk who relates them; or Miracles to prove both parts of a Contradiction to be true; as for Instance, that the Virgin Mary, was, and was not conceived in Original Sin. But if ever they had suffered poor *Fetzer's* Fate, they would rather hereafter believe, than feel such Miracles. Still continued, and denied by none but Scepticks, in dispossession of Devils: I suppose, he means the Boy of *Bilston*, and curing the *Struma*, the Kings-Evil, but this is a Protestant, as well as Popish Miracle, and is an etter
proof,

proof, that the King, than that the Pope, is the Head of the Church.

12. *The Gift of Prophecy.* Witness the Maid of Kent. To say nothing concerning the Confession of Adversaries, and unhappy Exit of the Churches Enemies. Which may very well be spared; for there have been Confessions, and unhappy Exits on both sides. Tho Hen. 8. Queen Elizabeth, and King James I. were no Examples of such unhappy Exits. *These, These are the Notes, which (like a Bill in Parliament) deserve a second Reading,* and then to be thrown out, though I hope they will never come in there.

The way being thus prepared, the Court sat, and the Jury of Notes empannell'd, which I suppose is the reason why he calls but 12 of Bellarmin's 15, the rest being Supernumeraries, the Discourser is summoned to make his Appearance. *Enter Discourser.* Which, I can assure you, put him into a fright on the sudden, fearing it might be the Inquisition; but he recollected himself, and thus began his Plea.

Pag. 5.

Is not the Catholick Church visible? And if we can see, which is the Church, what need we guess at it by Marks and Signs? (and that by such Marks and Signs too, as are matter of dispute themselves? cannot we distinguish between the Christian Church, and a Turkish Mosque, and a Jewish Synagogue?) cannot we without all this ado distinguish a Christian from a Turk, or a Jew, or a Pagan? And it will be as easy to find out a Christian Church, as it will be to find out Christians. And what now is the hurt of this? Oh! says the Justifier, What Spirit is that which envies the Christian the Felicity of finding the true Church, and casts an evil Eye upon the Notes conducing to it, let any Christian judg? A very Evil Spirit doubtless! But does the Dis-

Disc. p. 1.

C

courser

courser do this? Who says, that the Church is visible, and may be known without disputable Notes? for Notes are only to discover things absent and invisible, but what is visible is best known by it self. *Yes, for whereas he pretends 'tis visible (besides that he flatly denies it after, p. 14.) Nay say I, not among Counterfeits; Is it visible at Sea, which is the Royal Navy, when the Enemy puts up the English Colours?*

First, then, let us reconcile the Discourser with himself. He asks, whether the Church be not visible? and therein appeals to the Confession of his Adversaries, that the Church is visible, and wonders, what need there is of Notes, of disputable Notes, to find out a visible Church, in *Pag. 14.* He desires to know, *How they will prove, that there is a Church without the Scripture.* He answers for them, that *the Church is visible, for we see a Christian Church in the World;* but says he, *What is it I see? I see a Company of Men, who call themselves a Church, and this is all, that I can see, and is this seeing a Church? A Church must have a divine Original and Institution, and therefore there is no seeing a Church without seeing its Charter,* and is this to deny the Visibility of the Church, because it cannot be seen or known without its Charter, when it Charter is as visible as the Society, which calls its self the Church? And surely that Church is visible enough, whose Society and Charter are both visible, tho the Church cannot be known without its Charter.

But now the Answerer will not allow the Church to be visible *among Counterfeits*, and then it has not been visible this hundred Years at least; and then what becomes of *Bellarmin's* Notes, which are none, if the

†

Church

Church be not visible, for they are Notes not of an invisible, but of a visible Church. But the Comparison whereby he proves this, is an eternal Confutation of such extra-essential Notes. *Is it visible at Sea which is the Royal Navy, when the Enemy puts up the English Colours?* Which shows how fallible Notes are; for Colours are Notes of the Royal Navy, and these may deceive us; but if you go aboard and see the Ships and the Company and their Commissions, you cannot be mistaken. The Natures of things cannot be counterfeited, but Notes may.

The Discourser says, *A Christian Church is nothing else but a Society of Christians united under Christian Pastors for the Worship of Christ.* This the Justifier thinks a very slight way of speaking, *nothing else But!* and if he does not understand English, I cannot help that. But **CHRISTIAN PASTORS** for a need will take in Presbyters, who renounce Episcopacy, nay Congregational, who renounce Presbytery; It takes in indeed all Christian Pastors be they what they will. Whether Presbyterian and Independent Ministers are Christian Pastors, the Discourser was not concerned to determine; for he did not undertake to tell in particular, which are true Christian Churches, but what is the general Notion of a Christian Church; who are true Pastors, but that the Union of Christians under true Christian Pastors makes a Church: Tho the *Pastores Ecclesiae* in the ancient Language signified only Bishops, who had the care of the Flock, and the government of the inferiour Presbyters. Thus *the Worship of Christ*, he says, may signify *with Liturgy, or without it, with the Apostles Creed, or without it; &c.* And so it may if both *with* and *without* be the true Worship of Christ.

What a long Definition must the Discourfer have given of a Christian Church, had he been directed by this Author, and stated all the Controversies about Episcopacy and Presbytery, and the several Kinds and Modes of Worship in his Definition ; which, when he had done it, had been nothing at all to his purpose.

The Discourfer proceeds. *All such particular or National Churches all the World over, make up the whole Christian Church, or Universal Church of Christ. Yes (says the Justifier, pag. 6.) and all such Churches of Christ (if they could meet) would be like the Men in the Market-place, one crying out one thing, and another another, and no Authority could send them home peaceably to their Dwellings.* I confess, I am of another Mind, that could all the Churches in the World meet, how much soever they differ at a distance, they would agree better before they parted ; and this I think, all those should believe, who have any Reverence for General Councils, which certainly such a Meeting as this would be in a proper sense.

Well! But there is *Schism lies in the Word National Church.* How so, good Sir? *as if Nations here were at their own disposal.* And pray, why may not all the Churches in a Nation unite into one National Communion ; And how is this a Schism, if they maintain Brotherly Communion with other Christian Churches? Or *as if Christ begged leave of the Potentates of the Earth to plant his Truth among them.* Why so? Cannot there be a National Church without *Christ's begging leave of Potentates to plant his Gospel among them?* Suppose there be Churches planted

ted in a Nation without the leave of the Potentates, may not all these Churches unite into a National Communion without the leave of Potentates too? And is not such a National Union of Churches a National Church? Suppose Princes voluntarily submit their Scepters to Christ, and encourage and protect the Christian Churches in their Dominions, and unite them all into one National Church; is there any need of Christ's asking leave of such Potentates, who willingly devote themselves to his Service? But he says, *the greater Mistake is, that these Churches all put together make up the Universal Church of Christ.* But are not all the Churches the Universal Church? What then is the Universal Church but All? Yes, he says, *Universal enough, I confess, but where is the Unity?* Why, is it impossible that all Churches should be united in one Communion? If it be, then Unity is not necessary, or the Universal Church does not include all Churches: If it be not, then all Churches may be the Universal, the One Catholick Church of Christ. *We* (says he) *look for Unity, they shew us Multitude and Division.* Is Multitude and Division the same thing? Or is Unity inconsistent with Multitude? How then could the Churches of *Jerusalem*, of *Antioch*, of *Corinth*, of *Ephesus*, of *Rome*, be one Church? *We desire Unity, they shew us Universality:* As if there could not be Unity in Universality? I wish this Author would first learn Grammar and Logick, or, which I fear is harder to teach him, common sense, before he pretends again to dispute in Divinity: but now we have him, we must make the best of him we can.

And here the Answerer spends several Pages in proving that the Church must be One, which no body that I know of denies, and which he may find truly stated in answer to Cardinal *Bellarmino's* seventh Note. But what is this to the Discourser, who was not concerned to state this Point? He gives such a Definition of a Church, as belongs to all true particular Churches, as every Man ought to do, who gives the Definition of a Church; for a particular Church has the entire Nature and Essence of a Church; and there can be no true Definition of a Church, but what belongs to a particular Church. He says indeed, that the Universal Church consists of all true particular Churches, and so most certainly it does; No, says the Answerer, all particular Churches are not at Unity, and therefore they cannot be the One Catholick, or Universal Church. But suppose this, is there any other Notion of the Universal Church, but that it is made up of all true particular Churches, which is all that the Discourser asserted, without considering how all particular Churches must be united to make the One Catholick Church, which was nothing to his purpose. In such a divided State of Christendom as this, meer external Unity and Communion cannot be the Mark of a true Church, because all Churches are divided from each other. If we are not at Unity with the Church of *Rome*, no more is the Church of *Rome* at Unity with us; and if meer Unity be the Mark of the true Church, neither part of the Division can pretend to it. And therefore either some Churches may be true Churches, which

which are not at Unity with all others, or there is no true Church in the World. And therefore though Cardinal *Bellarmino* makes Unity the Mark of a true Church, yet not the Unity of all Churches with each other, for he knew, there was no such thing in his Days in the World, and I fear is not likely to be again in haste; but the Unity of Churches to the Bishop of *Rome*, who is the visible Head of the Church: And thus the Catholick Church signifies all those Churches which are united to the Bishop of *Rome*, as the Center of Unity. But this is such an Unity as the Scripture says nothing of, and which Protestants disown, and which this Answerer has not said one word to prove; for this is the Unity of Subjection, not the Unity of Love and Charity, which Christ and his Apostles so vehemently press us to. Now if the Unity of the Catholick Church does not consist in Subjection to a visible Head, and all other external Communion is broken and divided, we must content our selves to know, what it is that makes a particular National Church, a true, sound and pure Church; for whatever Divisions there are in the World, every true Church is part of Christ's one Catholick Church. And whatever Unity there be among other Churches, if they be not true Churches, they are no Parts of Christ's Catholick Church. And this was all the Discourser intended, or was obliged to in pursuit of his Design.

And thus I might pass over what he talks about Church-Unity, but that he has some very peculiar Marks which are worth our notice.

He says, *pag. 7. Protestants save the Unity of the Church, mainly because Christendom is divided and separated*

ted from Heathenism (which I wish heartily all Christendom perfectly were) *not considering so much the Unity with it self.* But pray who told him, that Protestants do not place the Unity of the Church in Unity, but in Separation? All true Christian Churches are united in the most essential things: They have one Hope, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all, and this makes them *one Body* animated by the same Holy Spirit, which dwells in the whole Christian Church; *Ephes. 4. 4, 5, 6.* But still they are not one entire Communion, but divide and separate from each other: This we will grant is a very great Fault, but yet if they communicate in such things, as makes one Church, whatever their other Divisions are, they are one Church still; their Quarrels and Divisions may hurt themselves, but cannot destroy the Unity of the Church; for the Church is one Body, not merely by the Unity and Agreement of Christians among themselves; but by the Appointment and Institution of Christ, who has made all those who profess the true Faith, and are united in the same Sacraments, to belong to the same Body, to be his One Body. And therefore Christians are never exhorted to be one Body; for that they are if they be Christians, as the Apostle expressly asserts, that Christians are but one Body; but they are exhorted to live in Unity and Concord, because they are but one Body: *I therefore the Prisoner of the Lord, beseech you, that ye walk worthy of the Vocation, wherewith you are called, with all Lowliness and Meekness, with Long-suffering, forbearing one another in Love: Endeavouring to keep the Unity of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace. There*

Ephes. 4. 1, 2,
3.

is *One Body, and one Spirit*.——Because there is but *one Body and one Spirit*, therefore they must endeavour to preserve the *Unity of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace*. Which supposes the Christian Church to be *one Body* by Institution, though the external Peace of the Church be broken by Schisms and Factions; because our Obligation to preserve the Peace of the Church, and the Unity of Ecclesiastical Communion, results from this Unity of Body; which makes Schism a very great Evil, and very destructive to Mens Souls, as all other Vices are; but the Church, which has but one Hope, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all, is but one Church still, though Christians quarrel with each other. Thus St. Paul asserts, that *as the Body is one, and hath many Members, and all the Members of that one Body being many, are one Body; so also is Christ*. But how do all Christians come to be one Body in Christ? That he answers, *for by one Spirit are we all baptized into one Body——and have been made to drink into one Spirit*. And from hence he shews, what Tenderneſs all Christians ought to express for each other, as being Members of each other. Pag. 25. *That there should be no Schism in the Body, but that the Members should have the same care one for another*. But suppose Christians have not this mutual care one of another, do they cease to be Members of the same Body? No such matter: these Quarrels between the Members of the same Body are very unnatural, but they are the same Body still. Pag. 15, 16. *If the Foot shall say, because I am not the Hand, I am not of the Body, is it therefore not of the Body? And if the Ear shall say, be-*
1 Cor. 12. 12, 13, &c.

cause I am not the Eye, I am not of the Body, is it therefore not of the Body? That is, though the Members of the same Body out of Discontent, and Envy, and Emulation, should separate from each other, and deny that they belong to the same Body, yet they are of the Body still. For we must consider, that the Schisms in the Church of *Corinth* were occasioned by an Emulation of Spiritual Gifts, and unless every one of them could be an Eye or an Hand, that is, have the most eminent Gifts, they envied and divided from each other, as if they did not belong to the same Body; which the Apostle tells them, was as absurd, as if the Eye and the Hand and the Foot should deny their Relation to the same Natural Body, because they differed in their Use and Honour: however if such a thing were possible in the Natural Body, they would all belong to the same Body still; and so it is in the Christian Church. Which shews, that the whole Christian Church is the one Mystical Body of Christ, united to him by Faith and Baptism, notwithstanding all the Divisions of Christendom.

For let us consider, what the Divisions of Christendom are, and whether they be such, as wholly destroy the Unity of the Body. All the Churches in the World are divided from the Church of *Rome* by disowning the Authority of the Pope, as the visible Head of the Catholic Church; but this does not destroy the Unity of the Body, because the Unity of the Body does not consist in the Union of all Churches to one visible Head, but in their Union to Christ, who is the one Lord of the Church. Some Churches are divided in Faith; not but that they agree in the necessary Articles of the Christian Faith,

Faith, (for to renounce any essential Article of the Christian Faith does so far unchurch) but some Churches believe only what Christ and his Apostles taught, others together with the true Faith of Christ teach Heretical Doctrines, contrary to that form of sound Words once delivered to the Saints. And though this must of necessity divide Communions, for if any Church corrupt the Christian Faith, with new and perverse Doctrines of her own, other Orthodox Christians are not bound to believe as they do; yet both of them are true Christian Churches still; for the true Faith makes a true Church; but only with this difference, that those who profess the true Faith of Christ without any corrupt Mixtures, are Sound and Orthodox Churches; other Churches are more or less pure according to the various Corruptions of their Faith. And thus it is with respect to the Christian Sacraments, and Christian Worship; every Church which observes the Institutions of our Saviour, and worships God the Father through our Lord Jesus Christ, is a true Church; but those Churches which corrupt this Worship, though they are true, are corrupt Churches; as the Church of *Rome* does in the Worship of Saints and Angels, and the Virgin *Mary*, and the Adoration of the Host, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, &c. And in this case, though what they retain of the Essentials of Christian Worship is sufficient to denominate them true Churches, yet other Churches are not bound to Communicate with them in their Corruptions.

The plain state then of the case is this. All Churches which profess the true Faith and Worship of Christ, though intermixed with great Corruptions, belong to the one Body of Christ; and to know whether any

Church be a true Church, we must not so much enquire, whom they communicate with, or separate from, but what their Faith and Worship is. That external Unity is so far from being the Mark of a true Church, that we may be bound not to communicate with true Churches, which are corrupt; because we are not bound to communicate in a corrupt Faith or Worship: And that in this case the guilt of Separation lies on that side where the Corruptions are. And yet all the Christian Churches in the World, that retain the true Faith and Worship of Christ, though they are divided from each other upon the Disputes of Faith or Worship or Discipline, are yet the One Church of Christ, as being united in the Essentials of Faith and Worship, which by the Institution of Christ makes them his one Mystical Body, and one Church.

Some Lines after he has a very notable Remark about the Unity of the Church. That the Church *admits not, but casts out some, though they profess Christianity, Schismatics, Hereticks; which being cast out, if you mark it well, she is united with her self.* And I assure you, it is worth marking; for if you mark it well, every Conventicle in Christendom is thus united with it self. But is this the Unity of the Catholick Church, to cast all out of our Communion, who are not of our Mind, and then call our selves the Catholick Church, when there are a great many other Churches which profess the Faith of Christ as truly and sincerely as we do, and are as much united among themselves, as we are? Why may not the Church of *England* upon this Principle call her self the Catholick Church? For she has more Unity in this way, than the Church of *Rome* has. When all
Here-

Hereticks and Schismaticks are cast out, she is united with her self; and if this Unity be a Mark of the Catholick Church, all the Churches and Conventicles of Chriftenom are the Catholick Church, for they are all united with themselves. But then the difficulty will be, how all these Churches, which are united with themselves, but separated from one another, make one Catholick Church? or, which of these Churches, which are thus united with themselves (which it seems is Catholick Unity) is the One Church? for every one of them have this Mark of the Catholick Church, that they are united with themselves.

He proves (Pag. 8.) *That Schismaticks are not of the Church, one Holy entire Church, from their very Name, which signifies rending and tearing, not the Seamless Coat alone, but the blessed Body of our Lord.* And I must confess, the Name Schismatick is as good a Mark of a Schismatical Church, as the Name Catholick is of the Catholick Church: But we must consider, who are the God-Fathers, and whether they have given proper Names or not. Now the Church of *Rome* is the common God-Mother, which Christens her self *Catholick*, and all other Churches *Schismaticks*, but whether she be infallible in giving Names, ought to be considered.

But Schism signifies *rending and tearing*; and yet a Schismatical Church signifies a Church too, and how they are a Church without belonging to the *One Church*, when there is but *One Church*, is somewhat mysterious. And therefore Schism is not tearing off a part of the Church, but one part dividing from the other in external Communion, which supposes that both parts still belong to the same Church, or else the Church is not divided. For Apostacy and Schism.

Schism are two different things; Apostates cease to be of the Church, Schismatics are of the Church still, though they disturb the Peace of the Church, and divide the external Communion of it; which differ as forsaking the Church, and going out of it (which no Man does, who does not renounce the Faith of Christ) and raising Quarrels and Contentions in it, to the alienating of Christians from each other.

But that Schismatics are not of the Church, he proves from St. Paul's rebuking his siding Corinthians with this quick Interrogatory: *Is Christ saith he (he means his Catholick Church) divided? How! nothing more absurd, than to grant division in the Church.* An excellent Paragraph! does St. Paul, who reproves these Corinthians for their Schisms, shut them out of the Church for them too? does he deny them to belong to the Church, when he directs his Epistle to the Church of God at Corinth? Is it so very absurd, to grant that there are Divisions in the Church, when St. Paul rebukes them for their Divisions, which surely supposes that they were divided? And is it absurd to suppose that to be, which at the same time we confess to be? To say that Christ is divided, or that there are more Christs than one, would be very absurd indeed; to say, that the Church of Christ is divided, is no Absurdity, because it is true; but the Absurdity or Unreasonableness, and Indecency, which St. Paul charges them with, is the Absurdity in Practice, that when there is but one Christ, one Lord, whom they all worship, that the Disciples of the same Lord should divide from each other, as if they served and worshipped different Masters.

But he has a very choice Note about the Unity of the Church, (Pag. 9.) *That it is the Unity of a Body, a living*

living animate Body; but not I hope of a Natural, but a Myſtical Body, animated by that Divine Spirit which dwells in the whole, and in every part of it, and therefore nothing can cut us off from the Unity of this Body, but that which divides us totally from the quickning and animating Influences of this Spirit, which it is certain all external Diviſions do not. Well! but it is not the Unity of a *Mathematical Body which is diviſible in ſemper diviſibilia, but animate*. This I believe every Body will grant him, that the Church is not a Mathematical Body; but what hurt is there in Mathematical Unity? Oh! that is diviſible without end, and that I confeſs is an ill kind of Unity: But I hope it is one, till it be divided, and I fear a living animate Body is diviſible too; and if that cannot be one, which is diviſible, I fear there is no ſuch thing as Unity in Nature, excepting in God; and then it is not ſufficient to prove the Catholick Church to be one, becauſe it is united, unleſs he can prove, that it is not diviſible. But indeed he is a little out in applying his Axiom, for as much as he deſpiſes this Mathematical Unity, he can find this indiviſible Unity only in a Mathematical Point; and poſſibly this may be the Reaſon, why the Church of Rome makes the Pope the Center of Catholick Unity, which is as near a Mathematical Point, as it well can be.

In the ſame place he very gravely asks; *If the Church of God be diſtinguiſhed even from the Heretick and the Schiſmatick, which of the Churches is like to be moſt Catholick? That which maintains its Unity againſt Hereſy and Schiſm, or that which is moſt favourable to the Separation?* No doubt, Sir, that which oppoſes Hereſy and Schiſm is the moſt Catholick Church; but

I thought the Question had been not about the *Most*, but the *One* Catholick Church. For one Church may be more Catholick than another, by more strictly adhering to the Catholick Faith and Worship, and yet both of them belong to the same Catholick Church. Well, but what then? Truly I cannot guess, he says, *the Dissenter scarce owns any such Distinctions, or very rarely what?* Do they never talk of Heresy and Schism? nor own that there are any Heresies and Schisms? But they pronounce no *Anathema's*, except one perhaps. Against the Church of Rome I suppose he means. But *Anathema's* are proper only for General Councils; and this is a new Note of the Catholick Church, which *Bellarmino* did not think of, viz. *Pronouncing Anathema's*, in which the Church of Rome has outdone all Churches in the World, and therefore is the most Catholick Church. But they would have Dissenters looked upon as Members of the Aggregate Church, notwithstanding their Dissensions as well as others. Who are these They? the Church of England: Then they are kinder to Dissenters than the Church of Rome, notwithstanding all the good Words they have lately given them. But what then? What then do you say? There is a terrible Then. For this Kindness of the persecuting Church of England to the Dissenters proves her to be a Harlot. For 'tis the famous Case brought before King Solomon, *Catholicks like the honest Woman would have the whole Child; the Harlot would have the Child divided.* Was ever such Stuff put together? Catholicks are for shutting all out of the Church, and being the whole Church themselves, therefore they are for the whole Child, when they have cut off three parts of it, and divided it in-

to a whole, *united with it self*. Others are so charitable as far as it is possible, to make *a whole Church, the One Catholick Church*, of all the divided Communion of Christendom, and they, like *the Harlot, would have the Child divided*. What a Blessing is Ignorance and Stupidity! The first to find out such Arguments, as all the Wit and Learning in the World could never have discovered; and the second to make Men believe them, and publish them without blushing. But here is enough in all Conscience of this; let us now try if we can pick out any thing, that may deserve an Answer. And that the Reader may the better judg between us, I shall take a Review of *the Brief Discourse concerning the Notes of the Church* in the Method wherein it lies, and consider, what this Answerer and Justifier of *Bellarmino's* Notes has to say against it.

I observed then that the true State of this Controversy about the Notes of the Church, as it is managed by Cardinal Bellarmine, is not, *what it is which makes a Church a true Church*;——but *how among all the Divisions of Christendom, we may find out that only true Church, which is the Mistress of all other Churches, the only Infallible Guide in matters of Faith, and to which alone the Promises of Pardon and Salvation are made*. Now the Answerer grants, that this is the Controversy between us, and says *the Roman-Catholicks put the Question right*. And no doubt but they have Christian Liberty to put what Questions they please; all that I there observed was, that Protestants in the Notes they gave of a Church, answer to that Question, What a true Church is, that Papists give Notes, whereby to know which is the True Church, and

Disc. P. 5.

which is the most reasonable way? shall be examined presently.

Pag. 6.

I began with the Protestant Way, *To find out a Church by the essential Properties of the Church, such as the Profession of the true Christian Faith, and the Christian Sacraments rightly and duly administered by Persons rightly ordained, according to the Institution of our Saviour, and the Apostolical Practice.* Here he complains that we give but (poor two) *Notes of a Christian Church* (pag. 12.) But if two be all, they are a great deal better than such fifteen Notes, as are none. And here I considered what Cardinal Bellarmine objects against these Notes.

1. *That Notes whereby we will distinguish things, must not be common to other things, but proper and peculiar to that of which it is a Note.*——Now I must confess these Notes, as he observes, are common to all Christian Churches, and were intended to be so.——The Protestant Churches do not desire to confine the Notes of the Church to their own private Communion, but are very glad, if all the Churches in the World be as true Churches as themselves. And this, says the Answerer, let me tell him, will be easily granted, tam, quàm, one every whit as good as another. And this, I wish, he could make good, for the sake of his own Church. But will he call this Answering? He cites a place out of *Tertullian*, which he durst not translate, for fear every English Reader should see that it was to no purpose: That Hereticks, tho they differed from each other, yet did all conspire to oppose the Truth; which is an admirable Argument against all Churches conspiring in the same Faith. But this he says, *supposes all Churches to be alike pure, equally Catholick, equally*

equally Apostolick. Just as much as to say, that a Man is a reasonable Creature, supposes all Men to be equally wise, and equally honest. The true Faith, and true Sacraments, I hope, may be essential to all true Churches, as Reason is to Humane Nature, and yet all true Churches may not retain the Christian Faith and Sacraments in equal Purity, no more than every Man, who has Reason, reasons equally well and truly. And therefore the Church of *England* can distinguish her self still both from Papists and Fanaticks notwithstanding these Notes.

His next Argument, why these cannot be the Notes of the Church, is, because the *true Faith, and true Sacraments, are essential to the Church*, and therefore can be *no Notes of Discovery*, (pag. 13.) according to his former wise Observation, that a Note must be *extra-essential*, which has been examined already. For, says he, *the Question is which is the true Church?* But Protestants think the first Question ought to be, What a true Church is? and then we can know without any other Notes, which is a true Church; as when we know what a Man is, we can easily find out a Man. But *how shall I know half this Essence, true Faith?* &c. *We must either say by consent with Scripture, or consent with the Primitive Church, and then we shall stumble upon the Cardinal's Notes, or somewhat like it.* They I confess will be in danger of a very fatal Stumble, if they stumble either upon Scripture or Antiquity; but we dare venture both. Let them but grant, that true Faith is the Note of a true Church, and we will refer the Trial of our Faith to Scripture, and Antiquity, when they please: Tho Cardinal *Bellarmin* had so much Wit, as not to refer the Trial of the Churches Faith to Scripture.

I added, That when we give Notes, which belong to a whole Species, as we must do, when we give the Notes of a true Christian Church, we must give such Notes, as belong to the whole kind, that is, to all true Christian Churches. And though these Notes are common indeed to all true Christian Churches, yet they are proper and peculiar to a true Christian Church. As the essential Properties of a Man are common to all Men, but proper to Mankind: and this is necessary to make them true Notes; for such Notes of a Church, as do not fit all true Churches, cannot be true Notes. But this which is the true Answer to Bellarmine's Argument, he wisely drops.

Disc. p. 5.

As for what the Cardinal urges that all Sorts of Christians think themselves to have the True Faith, and True Sacraments: I answered; I am apt to think they do; but what then? If they have not the True Faith, and True Sacraments, they are not True Churches, whatever they think of it, and yet the True Faith and True Sacraments are certain Notes of the True Church. A Purchase upon a bad Title, which a Man thinks a good one, is not a good Estate; but yet a Purchase upon a Title, which is not only thought to be, but is a good one, is a good Estate.

To this he answers. This is the same Error again: for a good Title, I hope, is essential; 'tis no Note of a good Estate. Oh the Wit of some Disputers! What other Note is there of a good Estate, but a good Title? But he says there are other Notes, which lead to the Discovery of a good Title; what then? they are the Notes of the Title, not of the Estate; they prove a good Title, and a good Title makes a good Estate. And yet, that the Land be not praengaged, be free from all Incumbrances, that there be no flaw in the Demise, I take to be essential to a good Title, and therefore according, to
our

our Authors Logick, cannot be Notes neither.

But what is all this to the purpose? *Bellarmin* proves, That the true Faith cannot be the Note of a true Church, because all Sects of Christians pretend to it. I answer, that though those who pretend to the true Faith, and have it not, are not true Churches, yet those, who have the true Faith, are true Churches. As a Purchase upon a bad Title, which a Man thinks a good one, is not a good Estate, but yet a Purchase upon a good Title is a good Estate. To this the Justifier of *Bellarmin* answers, *That a good Title is essential, and therefore is no Note of a good Estate.* Whereas the Dispute here is not about essential, or extra-essential Notes, but whether the true Faith cannot be a Note of the true Church, because some Men pretend to the true Faith, who have it not. But want of Understanding is necessary to make some Men Answerers of Books, which Men of Understanding know they cannot answer.

The Cardinal's second Objection against the Protestant Notes of a Church is, *That the Notes of any thing must be more known than the thing it self*; this I granted, *Now says he, which is the true Church, is more knowable, than which is the true Faith*: and this I denied, *for this plain reason, because the true Church cannot be known without knowing the true Faith*: For no Church is a true Church, which does not profess the true Faith. Now says our Answerer, *This being denied, we prove it thus, &c.* (Pag. 15.) But methinks, he should first have answered the Argument, before he had gone to proving; but that it seems is not his Talent. Well, but how does he prove, that the true Church may be known before we know the true Faith? Admirably I assure you! *If the*

Disc. p. 9.

the Church be the Pillar of Truth, raised up aloft, that it may be conspicuous to all Men, it must be more manifest than the Truth. This Pillar raised aloft is a new Notion, which I suppose he learnt from the Monument at London-Bridg, which indeed is very visible; but other wiser Writers *by the Pillar and Ground of Truth*, prove, that the Church is the Foundation, whereon Truth is built; but that would not serve his purpose, to make the Church more visible than the Truth, for he knows that the Foundation is not so visible, as that which is built on it: And in the next Page he honestly confesses, that the true Faith is the Foundation of the Church, and therefore proves that the true Church cannot be known by the true Faith; for *that is as if I should say, I cannot know the House unless I see the Foundation, the next way to overturn it.* So dangerous a thing are Metaphors, which prove backward and forward, as a Man fancies. But let the Church *be a Pillar raised aloft*, or a Foundation-Pillar, or what Pillar he pleases, must not we know the Church, before we know it to be a Pillar of Truth? Or, can we know which Church is the Pillar of Truth, before we know what Truth is?

Well! But let us now look to our selves, for he undertakes *to demonstrate it.* *The Fruits of the Spirit, the Graces, are more known than the Spirit it self.* Ergo, the true Church must be known before the true Faith. *The outward profession of Faith more than the inward profession.* Ergo, The true Church must be known before the outward profession of the true Faith, which makes a true Church. *The Concrete more than the Abstract, the Believer than the Belief.* I can know the Men before

fore I know their Faith, *Ergo*, the true Church must be known before the true Faith. He is a very hard-hearted Man, who will not allow this for Demonstration; but he is a very good-natured Man, who will allow it to be Sense.

Well! But he has a Distinction, that will do the Business. *Aliud notius nobis & aliud natura, i. e.* Some things are more knowable in themselves, and some things are more knowable to us: But we are enquiring which is most knowable to us, the true Faith, or the true Church.

He grants then, that True Faith being a Constituent of, or essential to the Church, may be said to be *Naturâ notior, first known in the Order of Nature.* But we would not have these Methods confounded: For if Faith be essential, 'tis the less known to us for that very reason; because the first Constituents of a Compound are last known, except to the Maker. 'Tis more manifest to us, that we are Flesh and Blood, though God knows, that we are Dust and Ashes. How happy is the Age, that has produced so great a Schoolman as this, to whom the great *Aquinas* himself is but a meer Novice! The Church is a compound Body, in which Faith is mixed and blended, as the four Elements are in Natural Bodies: And therefore as we can more easily know what a Stone or a Tree is, than see the four Elements in it, Fire and Air and Water and Earth, of which it is compounded, and which are so mixt together, as to become invisible in their own Natures; so the Church is more knowable than the true Faith, which is so compounded with the Church, as to become invisible
it

it self: Nay to be as much changed and transformed in the Composition, as Dust and Ashes is into Flesh and Blood: And thus I confess, he has hit upon the true Reason, why the true Church must be known before the true Faith, because the Church of *Rome* (which is his true Church) has so changed and transformed the Faith, that unless the Faith can be known by the Church, the Church can never be known by the Faith. How much is one grain of common Sense, better than all these Philosophical Subtilties? For indeed the Church is not a compound Body, but a Society of Men professing the Faith of Christ, and the only difference between them and other Societies is the Christian Faith, and therefore the Christian Faith is the only thing whereby the Church is to be known, and to be distinguished from other Bodies of Men; and therefore the Church cannot be known without the Faith; unless I can know any thing without knowing that, by which alone it is what it is: And when there are several Churches in the World, and a Dispute arises, which is the true Church, there is no other possible way of deciding it without knowing the true Faith; for it is the true Faith, which makes a true Church, *not as Dust and Ashes make Flesh and Blood*, but as a true Faith makes true Believers, and true Believers a true Church; and tho' that Society of Men, which is the Church is visible, yet the true Church is no more visible than the true Faith; for to see a Church is to see a Society of Men who profess the true Faith, and how to see that without seeing the true Faith, is past my Understanding.

In the next place the Cardinal urges, That we cannot know what true Scripture is, nor what is the true Interpretation of Scripture, but from the Church; and therefore we must know the Church, before we can know the true Faith. To this I answered, As for the first, I readily grant, that at this distance from the writing the Books of the New Testament, there is no way to assure us, that they were written by the Apostles, or Apostolical men, and owned for inspired Writings, but the Testimony of the Church in all Ages. And our Answerer saies, I begin now to answer honestly, (p. 17.) and I am very glad I can please him. But it seems, I had pleased him better; if I would have called it an *Infallible Tradition*; but that *Infallible* is a word we Protestants are not much used to, when applied to *Tradition*; it satisfies us, if it be a very credible Tradition, the Truth of which we have no reason to suspect. But I have lost our Answerers favour for ever, by adding, *But herein we do not consider them as a Church, but as credible Witnesses.* This makes him sigh to think, how loth men are to own the Church. For these company of men so attesting, were Christians, not Vagrants, or idle Praters of strange news in ridiculous Stories, (I hope not, for then they could not be credible Witnesses) but were agreed in the Attestation of such a Divine Volume, not only as a Book (which would do very little Service indeed) but as a Rule, as an Oracle. All this I granted; but still the question is, whether that Testimony they give to the Scriptures, relies upon their Authority, considered as a Church, or considered only as credible Witnesses. And when this Author shall think fit to Answer what I there urge to prove, that they must not be considered as a Church, but as credible Witnesses, I shall think of a Reply, or shall yield the cause.

A Vindication of the Discourse,

Answerer is a most unmerciful man at comparisons. *For,* saies he, *to tell us we cannot know the Church, but by the Scripture, is to tell us that we cannot know a piece of Gold without a pair of Scales.* The weight of Gold, I suppose he means, and then it is pretty right; and if we must weigh Gold after our Father, I suppose, we may weigh it after the Church too, tho She be our Mother. *Or that a Child cannot know his Father, till he comes to read Philosophy, and understand the Secrets of Generation:* And it is well, if he can know him then: This, I confess, is exceeding apposite; for a Child must be a Traditionary Believer, and take his Mothers word (as Papists believe the Mother Church) who is his Father.

That we could not understand the true Interpretation of Scripture neither, without the Church. This I also denied, and gave my reasons for it, which our Answerer, according to his method of answering Books, takes no notice of, but gives his Reasons on the other side. I affirmed, *That the Scriptures are very intelligible in all things necessary to Salvation, to honest and diligent Readers.* Instead of this, he saies I affirm, *That every honest and diligent Reader knows the Sense* (of Scripture, it must be) *in all things necessary to Salvation;* which differ as much, as being intelligible, and being actually understood, tho I will excuse him so far, that I verily believe he had no dishonest Intention in changing my Words, but did not understand the difference between them: But, says he, *did not St. Peter write to honest and diligent Readers, when he warns them of wresting some places in St. Paul to their own Destruction, as others also did.* As they did other Scriptures also, St. Peter saies; but he saies too, that they were the *unlearned and the unstable,* who did thus. And tho the Scriptures be intelligible, such men need a guide,
not

not to dictate to them, but to expound Scripture, and help them to understand it; but does *St. Peter*, therefore warn them against reading the Scriptures, or direct them to receive the Sense of Scripture only from the Church? Or say, that honest and diligent Readers cannot understand them without the Authority of the Church? But it seems, there are several Articles very necessary to Salvation, which men cannot agree about, no not all Protestants, as the *Divinity of the Son of God*, the *necessity of good Works*, the *distinction of Sins mortal, and less mortal* (which is a new distinction, unless by *less mortal*, he means Venial, that is, not mortal at all) the *necessity of keeping the Lords day, and using the Lords Prayer*. Now these points are either intelligibly taught in the Scripture, or they are not; if not, how does he know they are in the Scripture? If they be, why cannot an honest and diligent Reader understand that which is intelligible? That all men do not agree about the Sense of Scripture in all points, is no better argument to prove that the Scriptures are not intelligible, than that Reason it self is not intelligible; for all men do not agree about that neither.

Well, but he will allow, *That honest Readers may arrive to the understanding of that part of Scripture, which the light of nature suggests: That we must not steal, defraud; we must do as we will be done by*, (p. 19.). But he little thinks what he hath done in granting this; for then, if the Church should expound Scripture against the light of Nature, honest Readers may understand the Scripture otherwise; and if the Church should be found tripping in such matters, honest Readers might be apt to question her Infallibility in other cases; for those who once mistake, can never be Infallible: And yet this light

of Nature teaches a great many shrewd things; and the Scripture teaches them too; and therefore, in these matters, honest and diligent Readers may understand the Scriptures, tho it be against the Exposition of the Church; as, That Divine Worship must be given to none but God: That God, who is an invisible Spirit, must not be worshipped by material and visible Images: That public Prayers ought to be in a Language which is understood by the People: That Marriage is honourable among all Men; That Faith is to be kept with all Men; That every Soul must be subject to the higher Powers: That none can judicially forgive Sins, but only God: That to forgive Sin, is not to punish it, and therefore God does not punish for those Sins which he has wholly pardoned: And other such like things, are taught by the light of Nature, as well as Scripture; and we thank him heartily, that he will give us leave to understand these things. But he proceeds, *'Tis the Revelation part, the Mysteries part, which is properly called the holy Scripture, which is not so perspicuous.* What, are not the words perspicuous and intelligible? To what purpose then were they writ? Or, is it the thing which is above our Comprehension? but that does not hinder, but we may understand what the Scripture teaches, tho we do not fully comprehend it. For I would know, whether they fully comprehend the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity and Incarnation, the Natures and Person of Christ, which were the Subject of the *Arian, Nestorian, and Eutychian* Heresies; when the Church teaches these things, I suppose they will not say they do; and yet they will own that they can understand what the Church teaches about them: And then, tho they cannot comprehend these mysteries; yet they may as well understand what
the

the Scripture, as what the Church teaches about them. Now, saies our Author, *to say the Scripture is plain to every honest private Reader in these Arcana, is to deny and cassate all Church History; make Oecumenical Councils ridiculous, run down all Synods and Convocations, that ever were or shall be.* Why so, I pray? Does Church-History, or Oecumenical Councils, all Convocations and Synods declare, That the Scriptures are not intelligible in these matters? Or that a private honest diligent Reader cannot understand them? How came they then to determine them for Articles of Faith, by their own Authority, or by the Authority of Scripture? Should Synods and Convocations, and Oecumenical Councils, determine that for an Article of Faith, which is not plain and intelligible in Scripture, they were ridiculous indeed, and there were an end of their Authority.

And here he appeals to the Testimonies produced by the Cardinal, out of *Irenæus, Tertullian, and St. Augustin*; which have been so often answered already, that I do not think it worth the while to engage with this Answerer about them; let the Reader, if he pleases, consult some late Books to this purpose; as that Learned Vindication of the Answer to the Royal Papers about Church Authority; and the *Pillar and ground of Truth*. But I cannot pass on without taking notice of his unanswerable Argument to prove, *That the Church of Rome understands St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, and by consequence the Articles of Justification, whether by Faith alone, or Works, better than all the Lay-Readers of the Reformation, viz. because he can never be perswaded that any private man should understand an Epistle of St Paul, better than the Church to which it was written. How unworthy is it to opine*

opine the contrary? And how silly is it to think, that those must necessarily understand an Epistle best, to whom it was written? But if those Christians at *Rome*, to whom *St. Paul* wrote (for he takes no notice of any formed and settled Church there, at the writing of his Epistle, and therefore does not direct it to the Church, as he does in other Epistles, but *to the Saints that are at Rome*. I say, if those Christians) might be supposed at that time, (when the state of the Controversy among them was generally known) to understand this Epistle better than we can now, yet what is this to the Church of *Rome*, at sixteen hundred years distance? However, by this Rule, we may understand all *St. Paul's* other Epistles, as well as the Church of *Rome*, and that will serve our purpose: And yet methinks, if the Churches to which the Epistles were sent, are the only Authentick Expositors of such Epistles, all those Churches to whom *St. Paul* wrote, should have been preserved to this day, to have expounded those Epistles to us, and yet not one of them is now in being, excepting the Church of *Rome*; and therefore, at least we must make what shift we can to expound them our selves, for the Church of *Rome* can pretend no greater right in them than the Church of *England*.

And thus I came in the second place to consider the Cardinals use of Notes, and found several faults with them: 1. *That he gives Notes to find out which is the true Church, before we know what a true Church is; whereas there are two Inquiries in order of nature before this, viz. Whether there be a true Church, or not; and what it is; And though the Cardinal takes it for granted, that there is a Church, I demanded a proof of it, that they would give me some Notes whereby to prove that there is a true Church.*

Church. This demand amazes our Answerer, and makes him cross himself and fall to his Beads, *Hear, O Heavens! and give ear, O earth!* But this is a Devil that won't be conjured down; let him either give me some Notes to prove, that there is a Church; or tell me, how I shall know it. Yes, that he will do, for *it is self-evident*, he saies, *that there is a Church*, (p. 20) *as it is, that there is a Sun in the Firmament, or else the Heathens could never see it.* But what do the Heathens see? a Christian Church. Do they then believe the Holy Catholick Church? why then does he call them Heathens? and if they see a Church, and do not believe it to be a Church, then it is such a seeing of a Church, as does not prove that there is a Church; for if it did, then all that see the Church would believe it, as all that see the Sun, believe that there is a Sun. Good works indeed may be seen, as he learnedly proves; and a Jewish Synagogue may be seen, and Christian Oratories and Chappels with Crosses upon them, and this may prove that those who built them, believed in a Crucified God, which is all he alledges to prove, that it is *self-evident* that there is a Church; by which I see something also that he does not know, What it is to see a Church; Though I told him before, *That to see a com-* Disc. p. 14.
pany of men, who call themselves a Church, is not to see a Church. For a Church must have a Divine Original and Institution, and therefore there is no seeing a Church, without seeing its Charter; for there can be no other Note or mark of the being of a Church, but the Institution of it.

I observed, *That the use of Notes in the Church of Rome is to find out the Church before and without the Scriptures; for if they admit of a Scripture-proof, they must allow, that we can know and understand the Scriptures*
without

A Vindication of the Discourse

without the authority or interpretation of the Church, which undermines the very foundation of Popery. In answer to this he says, Nothing is more easie and familiar (but that men love to be troublesome to their Friends) than that the Scriptures must be known by the Church, and the Church may be known (besides its own evidence) by the Scriptures.

This I believe he has heard so often said, without considering it, that it is become *very easie and familiar* to him; but it is the hardest thing in the world to me, and therefore begging leave of him for being so troublesome, I must desire him to explain to me how two things can be known by each other, when neither of them can be known first; for if the Son must beget the Father, and the Father beget the Son, which of them must be begotten first?

But he has an admirable proof of this way of knowing the Church by the Scripture, and the Scripture by the Church. For *so St. Peter exhorts the wife to good conversation, that she may thereby win the husband to Christianity, even without the Word, without the Holy Scripture: Implying, that a man may be brought over to Christianity both ways, by the Church, and by the Scripture.* Suppose this, what is this to knowing the Scripture by the Church, and the Church by the Scripture? The pious and modest conversation of the wife, may give her husband a good opinion of her Religion, and may be the first occasion of his inquiring into it, which may end in his conversion, and so may the holy and exemplary lives of Christians do; but does the Husband in this case resolve his faith into the authority of his Wife without the Scripture? and then resolve the authority of his wife into the authority of the Scripture? if St.

Peter

Peter had said this indeed, I should have thought we might as reasonably have given this authority to the Church, as to a Wife.

2ly, I observed, *Another blunder in this dispute about Notes is, that they give us Notes whereby to find out the true Catholick Church, before we know what a particular Church is——because the Catholick Church is nothing else but all the true Christian Churches in the world, united together by one common faith and worship, and such acts of communion as distinct Churches are capable of, and obliged to; every particular Church, which professes the true faith and worship of Christ, is a true Christian Church, and the Catholick Church is all the true Christian Churches in the world.——And therefore there can be no Notes of a true Church but what belong to all the true Christian Churches in the World.* Which shows how absurd it is, when they are giving Notes of a True Church, to give Notes of a true Catholick, and not of a true particular Church: when I know what makes a particular Church a true Church, I can know what the Catholick Church is, which signifies all true particular Churches, which are the one Mystical body of Christ; but I can never know what a true Catholick Church is, without knowing what makes a particular Church a true Church; for all Churches have the same nature, and are homogeneal parts of the same body.

This I perceive our Answerer did not understand one word of, and therefore says nothing to the main argument, which is to prove that those who will give Notes of the Church, must give such Notes as

are proper to all true particular Churches; for there can be no other true Notes of a Church, but what belong to all true Churches, because all true Churches have the same Nature and Essence; which spoils the Cardinal's design of Notes to find out the one Catholick Church, which all Christians must communicate in, and out of which there is no Salvation. And therefore, instead of touching upon the main point, he runs out into a new Harangue about Unity and Catholicism; what Unity and Communion makes a Catholick Church; whether the Catholick Church be the aggregate of all Churches, or only of Sound and Orthodox Churches, which has been considered already, and is nothing to the purpose here. For the only single question here is, Whether I can know the Catholick Church, before I know what a true particular Church is; and consequently, whether the Notes of the Church ought not to be such, as belong to all true particular Churches.

By this Rule, I briefly examined Cardinal *Bellarmin's* Notes; Those which belonged to all true Churches, which very few of them do, I allow to be true Notes, but not peculiar to the Church of *Rome*. *As the 6th, The agreement and consent in Doctrine with the Ancient and Apostolick Church. And the 8th, The Holiness of its Doctrine; are the chief, if not the only Notes of this nature, and these we will stand or fall by.* And because I said, we will stand or fall by these Notes, the Answerer endeavours to shew that they do not belong to the Church of *England*; but whether they belong to the Church of *Rome*, and do not belong to us, was not my business to consider in a general

ral Discourse about Notes; but it has been examined since, in the Examination of those particular Notes, and there the Reader may find it. But our Answerer according to his old wont, has pickt out as unlucky instances, as the greatest Adversary of the Church of Rome could have done, *viz.* the Doctrine of Justification and Repentance, which are not so corrupted by the very worst Fanaticks, as they are by the Church of Rome, witness their Doctrines of *Confession and Penance*; I may add, of *Merits and Indulgences*, for want of which, he quarrels with the Reformation. Other Notes, I observed, were not properly Notes of the true Church, any otherwise than as they are Testimonies to the Truth of common Christianity: Such as his 9th, the Efficacy of Doctrine: The 10th, the Holiness of the Lives of the first Authors and Fathers of our Religion. As for the Efficacy of Doctrine, he saies, *That should bear Testimony to the Church also, if it be true, that more are converted to the Catholick Church, than Apostatize from it.* Let him read the Examination of the 9th Note for this. But *if it be true also, that the Roman Catholicks do convert more to the Christian Faith, than any other sort of Christians, (as the Spaniards converted the poor Indians) this follows undeniably, that they believe they are more bound to spread the Christian Religion than any other.* And what if they did believe so, are not others as much bound as they? And what follows from hence? That they are the only true Church, because they are more zealous in propagating Christianity? Does this relate to the Efficacy of Doctrine, or to the Zeal of the Preacher? But he says, *The Pharisees compassing Sea and Land to make a Profelyte, proved them to be the best and most*

zealous of all the Jewish party, tho they made them ten times more the Children of Hell. than they were before. I think none but our Author would have had so little Wit, as to have justified the Church of *Rome* by the Zeal of the *Pharisees*; for tho, as he says, our Saviour's *Wo against the Pharisees*, was not *precisely* intended against their Zeal; yet this proves that the greatest Corrupters of the Faith, may be the most zealous to propagate their Errors; and therefore such a Zeal does not prove them to be the best men, nor the truest Church.

Thus I said the 11th Note, *the glory of Miracles*, and the 12th, *the spirit of Prophecie*, are Testimonies to the Religion, not primarily to the Church.

To which he answers, *Let no man be so besotted as to say, that all Miracles of a later date are delusions.* Fear not, Sir, no Miracles, neither late nor early, are delusions, but some delusions are called Miracles, witness the Miracles that poor *Jetzer* felt. But the question is, Whether true Miracles prove that particular Church in which they are done, the only true Church; or only give testimony to the Religion in confirmation of which they are wrought. *The spirit of Prophecie* also, he says, *belongs to the Church, unless we find that all the true Churches in the Circle pretend to it.* All that pretend to a Religion revealed by Prophecie, pretend to the spirit of Prophecie; but all do not pretend in this age to have the gift of Prophecie, though they may as justly pretend to it, as the Church of *Rome*. See the Answer to the 12th Note.

I add-

I added, *That the 13th, 14th, 15th Notes, I doubted would prove no Notes at all, because they are not always true, and at best uncertain. The 13th is the confession of Adversaries, which he says, will carry a cause in our Temporal Courts. And good reason too, because they are supposed to speak nothing but what they know, and what the evidence of truth extorts from them; but how the Adversaries of Christianity should come to know so well, which is the true Church, who believe no Church at all, is somewhat mysterious; and yet the Cardinal is miserably put to it to make out this Note, as may be seen in the Answer. The 15th, Temporal felicity, he says, will evidence the Church, as Job's later state did evidence his being in favour with God. But what did his former state do? Was he not then in favour with God too? but would any man talk at this rate, who remembers, that Christ was crucified, and his Church persecuted for three hundred years? The 14th, the unhappy Exit of the enemies of the Church, he says, Count Teckely may be a witness of it, who sides with Infidels against the Church, and is accordingly blest. And what thinks he of the misfortunes of some great Princes, who have been as zealous for the Church?*

His third and fourth Notes, I said, were not Notes of a Church, but Gods promises made to his Church. And here he triumphs mightily; Is there such opposition then between Notes and Promises? and finds out some promises which he says are Notes of the Church; I shall not examine that, because it is nothing to the

the purpose ; for if there be some Promises which are not Notes of the Church , I am safe ; for I did not say, that no Promises could be Notes, but that these were not Notes, but Promises, and gave my reasons for it, why these particular Promises could not be Notes. As for the third, *A long duration, that it shall never fail ;* I said, *this could never be a Note till the day of judgment.* A fine time, he says, *to chuse our Religion in the mean while ;* but thanks be to God, we have other Notes of a Church than this, and therefore need not wait till the day of Judgment, to know the true Church. But it is certain, the duration of the Church till the end of the World is such a mark of the Church as cannot be known till the end of the World. The fourth, *Amplitude and extent is not to distinguish one Christian Church from another, but to distinguish the Christian Church from other Religions ; and then I doubt this Prophecie has not received its just accomplishment yet, for all the Christian Churches together bear but a small proportion to the rest of the world.* And if this promise be not yet accomplished, it cannot be a Note of the Church. But the Reader may see all this fairly stated in the examination of these Notes.

His fifth Note, *The Succession of Bishops in the Church of Rome, from the Apostles time till now, I grant, is a Note of the Roman Church ; and the Succession of Bishops in the Greek Church, is as good a Note of the Greek Church ; and any Churches, which have been later planted, who have Bishops in Succession from any of the Apostles, or Apostolick Bishops, by this Note are as good Churches as they.* This he very honestly grants,

grants, and thereby confesses, that this Note will not prove the Church of *Rome* to be the one Catholick Church, which the Cardinal intended by it. Now because I said, *This Note is common to all true Churches, and therefore can do the Church of Rome no Service.* He takes me up, *All true Churches! then where is your Communion with Luther's or Calvin's Disciples? They do not so much as pretend to Succession.* Nor is this the Dispute now, whether those Churches which have not a Succession of Bishops, are true Churches; but if he will allow a Succession of Bishops to be a Note of a true Church, all those Churches are true Churches, which have this Succession, as the *Greek Church*, and the Church of *England* have; and therefore, this Note can do no Service to the Church of *Rome*, as not being peculiar to it. But as for what he says, *That Succession of Doctrine, without Succession of Office, is a poor Plea.* I must needs tell him, I think it is a much better Plea then Succession of Office, without Succession of Doctrine. For I am sure, that is not a safe Communion, where there is not a Succession of Apostolical Doctrine; but whether the want of a Succession of Bishops, will in all Cases Unchurch, will admit of a greater Dispute: I am sure a true Faith in Christ, with a true Gospel Conversation, will save men; and some Learned *Romanists* defend that old Definition of the Church, that it is *Cætus Fidelium*, the company of the Faithful, and will not admit Bishops or Pastors into the Definition of a Church.

Joan. Laun.
Epist. Vol. 8.
ep. 13. Nicol.
Gatinæo.

His seventh Note, I own, is home to his purpose, That that is the only true Church, which is united to the Bishop of Rome, as to its Head. If he could prove this, it must do his Business without any other Notes.— But it is like the Confidence of a Jesuit, to make that the Note of the Church, which is the chief Subject of the Dispute. Very well, says our Answerer, so Irenæus, so St. Cyprian, St. Ambrose, St. Hieron, Optatus, St. Austin, are answered, for none of these can turn the Scale. Nor did any of these Fathers ever say, That the Bishop of Rome is the Head of the Church. This is the Dispute still, and will be the Dispute, till the Church of Rome quit her absurd claims to it. But he says, We of the Church of England should consider, that not above 100 years ago, we communicated with the Apostolick See. And does that make the Church of Rome, the Head of the Church? But have we grounds enough for such a Breach, as we have made? It is ground enough sure, to Renounce our Subjection to the Bishop of Rome, if he have no right to claim it. But Transubstantiation, and the Worship of Images, and Addresses to Saints, he thinks very harmless things. But the mischief is, we do not think them so. But this is not a place to dispute these matters.

His first Note concerning the name Catholick, observed, makes every Church a Catholick Church, which will call it self so. And here he learnedly disputes about some indelible names, which the providence of God orders to be so for great Ends. St. Paul directs his Epistle to the Romans, i.e. he hopes to the Roman Catholicks, p.34. But a Roman Catholick was an unknown name in those days, and many Ages after. But at that

that time the world in the Apostles phrase was in Communion with her. Where has the Apostle any such Phrase? And yet we are now a disputing not about Catholick Communion, but about the name *Roman Catholick Church*. Whereas it does not appear, that the *Romans* had at that time so much as the Name of the Church, as I observed before; and the very Name of the *Catholick Church* cannot be proved so Ancient as that time: And her Faith being spoken of, which he interprets, her being admired throughout the whole World: whatever it proves, does not prove that She had then the Name of the Catholick Church. He adds, *It is not without something of God, that She keeps the name still*: But how does She keep it? She will call her self Catholick, when no Body else will allow her to be so; and thus any Church may keep this Name, which did Originally belong to all true Orthodox Churches: As for Hereticks, they have challenged the Name, and kept it too among themselves, as the Church of *Rome* does, tho it belonged no more to them, than it does to her. His other indelible names of Times and Places, he may make the best of he can. But let all concerned in *Black-fryars* and *Austin-fryars*, and the House of *Chartreux*, which has so miraculously preserved its Name, look to it; for he seems to hope, that these indelible Names are preserved for some good purpose.

I added, The name *Catholick* does not declare what a Church is, but in what Communion it is; and is no Note of a true Church, unless it be first proved, that they are true Churches, which are in Communion with each other. For if three parts in four, of all

Disc. p. 17.

the Churches in the World, were very corrupt and degenerate in Faith and Worship, and were in one Communion, this would be the most Catholick Communion, as Catholick signifies the most General and Universal; but yet, the fourth part, which is sincere, would be the best and truest Church, and the Catholick Church, as that signifies the Communion of all Orthodox and pure Churches.

This Distinction of *Catholick*, our Answerer likes well, and says it *does not hurt them, for that case is yet to come, viz.* that the most corrupt Communion should be most Catholick or Universal; but that was not the force of the Argument, nor any part of it; tho it may be it is too true; but the Argument was this, That the bare Name of *Catholick* cannot prove a Church to be a true Church, because that does not relate to its Nature and Essence, but to its Communion: Now *Catholick Communion* signifies, either the most universal Communion, or the Communion only of pure and Orthodox Churches, be their number more or less. If we take it in the first Sense, the most Catholick Communion may be the most corrupt; for it may so happen, that the greater number of Churches, which are in Communion with each other, may be very corrupt. If we take it in the second Sense, we must first know, whether those Churches are Pure and Orthodox, before we can tell, whether they be Catholick Churches; and therefore, in both Senses, the bare Name of Catholick cannot prove a Church to be a true Church; for we must first know, whether they be true, as that signifies Pure and Orthodox Churches;

Churches, before we can know, whether they be Catholick.

But he says, *It is not probable, that God would spread such a Temptation and Stumbling-block before his own People; yet, if he should for Example sake, have suffered Lutheranism or Cranmerism to have spread to such a measure, the palpableness of the Schism would have been security, perhaps, sufficient to keep all prudent Persons where they were.* This is nothing to the present Argument, (as indeed it would be surprizing to find him say any thing to the purpose) but yet, if the most Catholick Communion, as that signifies the most Universal (tho the Notes does not refer to Catholick Communion, but to the name Catholick) were a Note of the true Church, it is not sufficient to say, *That it is probable that God will not suffer a corrupt Communion to be the most Universal; but he must prove, that God has promised this shall not be:* And, if according to this Supposition, *Lutheranism or Cranmerism* had prevailed, three parts in four over the Church, how could the palpableness of the Schism secure his prudent Man from the Infection? for if three parts of the Church were divided from the fourth, why should a prudent Man charge so much the greater number with the Schism? Why should the three parts be the Schismatics, and not the fourth?

3ly, I observed another Mystery of finding the true Church by Notes, is to pick out of all the Christian Churches in the World, one Church which we must own for the only Catholick Church, and reject

Disc. P. 19.

jest all other Churches as Heretical, or Schismatical, or Uncatholick Churches, who refuse Obedience and Subjection to this one Catholick Church. For if this be not the intent of it, what do all the Notes of the Church signifie to prove, that the Church of Rome is the only true Catholick Church? And if they do not prove this, the Cardinal has lost his Labour.

Now I observed, *That there are many things to be proved here, before we are ready for the Notes of the Church. They must first prove, that there is but one true Church in the World. Or, as I had expressed it before, One Church, which is the Mistress of all other Churches, and the only Principle and Center of Catholick Unity. To this he Answers, (p. 37.) That there is but one true Church, ought to be proved; (Credo unam Sanctam, doth, it seems, not prove it) but if there were as many Churches, as Provinces, if they are true, they are one, as hath been explained. Nor stands it with the very Institution of the Creed, to say, I believe many true Churches; no more than to say, I believe in many true Faiths; (which I suppose there is some new Institution for also, believing in the true Faith) for if they be true, say I, they are one (Harp not therefore any more on that jarring String.) It is really a miserable case for a Church, which is able to speak somewhat better for her self, to be exposed by such Advocates, as do not understand her own Principles. For will any learned *Romanist* deny, that there are several particular true Churches? Or, will any Protestant deny, that all true Churches are one Catholick Church, which we profess in our Creed? But the Controversy between us and the Cardinal, is quite*

quite of a different nature, not whether there are any particular true Churches, nor whether all the true Churches in the World make one Catholick Church; but whether the Church of *Rome* (which considered in it self is but a particular Church) be the only true Catholick Church, the center of Catholick Unity? so that no Church is a true Church, but only by communion with, and subjection to the Church of *Rome*. Now this he can never prove by the Notes of a true Church, unless he first prove, that there is but one particular Church, the communion with, and subjection to which makes all other Churches true Churches: For if there be more true Churches than one, which owe subjection to no other Church, but only a friendly and brotherly correspondence; then though his Notes of a Church could prove the Church of *Rome* to be a true Church, yet they could not prove, that all other Churches must be subject to the Church of *Rome*. The Church of *England* may be a true Church still, though she renounce obedience to the Bishop of *Rome*.

But he undertakes to prove the Church of *Rome*, not to be the *Mistress*, which as it may be construed, is *invidious* (though she challenges all the authority of a Mistress) but the *Mother* of other Churches. And if he could do it, it were nothing to the present argument, which is not, Whether the Church of *Rome* be the Mistress or Mother (which he pleases) of all other Churches, but whether the bare Notes of a true Church can prove this prerogative of the Church of *Rome*, when there are other true Churches.

Churches besides her self. But yet his arguments to prove this are very considerable :

1st. Because *the Church of Rome is acknowledged to be so by all in communion with her, (P.37.)* which is indeed unanswerable : The Church of Rome her self, and all in communion with her, say, she is the Mother of all other Churches, and therefore she is so.

2^{dly}, *The Learned King James the First, did not stick to own her.* Did King James the First own the Pope's Supremacy ?

3. *To us in England 'tis past denial, our Mother and Nurse too.* Our step-mother we will own her, and nothing more. But 'tis her authority that keeps up in England, above all other Reformed Churches, our Bishops, our Liturgy, our Cathedrals ; by her Records, her Evidences, they stand the shock of Antichristian Adversaries. This is strange news ! We are indeed then more beholden to the Church of Rome, than we thought for ; but does the Church of Rome allow our Bishops, or our Liturgy ? how then does her Authority keep them up ? truly only because she cannot pull them down, and I pray God she may never be able to do it. She is not *our Principle*, as he speaks, and never shall be *our Center again*. His fourth Argument is from *Vitruvius* (which I believe is the first time it was used) *from the situation of Rome for the Empire of the World*, which he thinks holds as well for the Empire of the Church. And so he concludes *with our Lords Elogies of St. Peter's Chair*, which I could never meet with yet. This is a formidable man, especially considering how many such Writers the Church of Rome is furnished with.

I added,

I added, *That they must prove, that the Catholicks Church does not signifie all the particular true Churches that are in the World, but some one Church, which is the fountain of Catholick Unity*: That is, says he, he should say, *not only signifie all, but also some one*, P. 39. No, Sir, I say, *not signifie all, but some one*. The Cardinal proposes to find out by his Notes the one true Catholick Church among all the Communions of Christendom; and to prove that the Church of Rome is this Catholick Church. Now I say, this is a senseless undertaking, unless he can prove, that the Catholick Church does not signifie all the particular true Churches, which make the one Church and Body of Christ, but some one Church, which is the fountain of Catholick Unity, and Communion with which, gives the denomination of Catholick Churches to all others. Now what has our Answerer to say to this, besides his Criticism of *all*, and *some one*? Truly he fairly grants it, and says, that *other Churches, as daughters of the Mother-church, are formally Catholick; but take the Mother by her self, and she is fundamentally Catholick*. But this I say, ought to have been proved, that there is any one Church which alone is the Catholick Church, as the foundation of Catholick Unity; which the Cardinal's Notes cannot prove. That the Catholick Church began in one single Church, (as he says) I readily grant, and became Catholick by spreading it self all over the World; but thus the Church at *Jerusalem*, not at *Rome*, was the *Matrix*, as he speaks, of the Catholick Church, which yet gave the Church of *Jerusalem* no prehemineny or authority over all other Churches. But the Church of *Rome* does not pretend her self to be *fundamentally Catholick* in this sense,

sense, that she was the first Church, but that by virtue of Saint *Peter's* Chair, the Sovereign Authority of the Church is seated in her, and none can belong to the Catholick Church, but those who embrace her Communion, and submit to her authority. Which shows how well our Answerer understood this Controversie, when he says, (*Pag. 40.*) *Time was when the Church of Jerusalem was so*, (that is, the Catholick Church, as it was the first and only Church, and the Matrix of all other Churches) *or the Church of Antioch*, (which never was so) *then why not the Church of Rome ? What think you, in the sense given ?* The Church of *Rome* does not challenge to be the Catholick Church in the sense now given, *i.e.* as the first and original Church; and if she did, all the World knows, she was not; and the sense now given will not prove the Church of *Rome* to be the Catholick Church, in the sense in which she claims it. But this is intolerable to dispute with men, who do not understand what they dispute about. To hasten then to a conclusion; for if my Reader, as I suspect, is by this time sick of Reading, he may easily guess, how sick I am of Writing.

Disc. p. 22.

The last thing I objected against *Bellarmin's* Notes was, That they pretend to find out an *infallible Church* by Notes, on whose authority we must relie for the whole Christian Faith, even for the Holy Scriptures themselves. For suppose he had given us the Notes of a true Church—before we can hence conclude, that this Church is the infallible Guide, and uncontrollable Judge of Controversies, we must be satisfied that the Church is infallible.—This can never be proved but by Scripture,

Scripture ; for unless Christ have bestowed Infallibility on the Church, I know not how we can prove she has it ; and whether Christ have done it or not, can never be proved but by the Scriptures : So that a man must read the Scriptures , and use his own judgment to understand them , before it can be proved to him, that there is an Infallible Church ; and therefore those who resolve the belief of the Scripture into the Authority of the Church, cannot without great impudence , urge the Authority of the Scriptures to prove the Churches Infallibility ; and yet thus they all do ; nay, prove their Notes of the Church from Scripture, as the Cardinal does. To which our Adversary answers : *Infallibility and Transubstantiation ; God forgive all the stirs that have been made upon their account.* Amen, say I, and so far we are agreed.

He makes some little offers at proving an Infallible Judg, or at least a Judg which must have the final decision of Controversies , whether Infallible or not ; this is not the present dispute, but how we shall know whether the Church be Infallible or not ? If by the Scriptures, how we shall know them without the Church ?

To avoid a Circle here of proving the Church by the Scriptures, and the Scriptures by the Church, he says, *There are other convictions whereby the Word of God first pointed at by the Church, makes out its Divine original.* But let him answer plainly, Whether we can know the Scriptures to be the Word of God, and understand the true sense of them, with-

out the Infallible authority of the Church? If he will say we can, we are agreed, and then we will grant, that we may find out the Church by the Scripture; but then he must not require us afterwards to receive the Scripture and interpretation of it upon the authority of the Church; And so farewell to Popery.

As for that advice I gave Protestants, *Where they dispute with Papists, whatever they do at other times, not to own the belief of the Scriptures, till they had proved them in their way by the authority of the Church: and then we should quickly see, what blessed work they would make of it: How they would prove their Churches Infallibility, and what fine Notes we should have of a Church, when we had rejected all their Scripture-proofs, as we ought to do, till they have first satisfied us, that theirs is the only true Infallible Church, upon whose authority we must believe the Scriptures, and every thing else.* He says, *it is very freakish, to say no worse — Especially when I grant (to my cost) that we come to the knowledg of the Scripture by the uninterrupted tradition of credible witnesses, though I will not say, tradition of the Church.* But if he understand no difference between the authority of an Infallible Judg; and of a Witness, he is not fit to be disputed with.

As for what I said, *That I would gladly hear what Notes they would give a Pagan to find out the true Infallible Church by;* he honestly confesses, *There can be no place for such Notes, when the authority of the Scripture is denied.* Which is a plain confession, how vain these Notes are, till men believe the
Scrip-

Scriptures ; and when they believe the Scriptures, they may find more essential Notes of a Church than these, viz. that true Evangelical Faith and Worship , which makes a Church ; but these Notes the Cardinal rejects , because we cannot know the true Faith, and the Scriptures, without the Church ; and the Justifier of *Bellarmin* says, that there can be no place for the Notes of the Church, when the Authority of the Scripture is denied : and therefore they must first agree this matter , before I can say any thing more to them.

But yet he says, *If the Church should say to a Pagan, We have some Books Sacred with us , which we reckon are Oracles of God , transmitted to us from generation to generation , for almost seventeen hundred years , which we and our forefathers have been versed in by daily Explications, Homilies, Sermons. However you accord not with the Contents of the Book , yet we justly take our selves to be the best Judges and Expounders of those Oracles. The Pagan would say , the Church spoke reason,* Pag. 44. But nothing to the purpose. For the question is , What Notes of a Church you will give to a Pagan , to convince him , which is the true Church, before he believes the Scripture ; and here you suppose a Pagan would grant, that you were the best Interpreters of Books that you accounted Divine, and had been versed in near seventeen hundred years. But would this make a Pagan believe the Scripture? Or take your words for such Notes of a Church , as you pretended to produce out of

A Vindication of the Discourse

Scripture? especially if he knew that there were other Christians, who pretended to the Scriptures and the interpretation of them, as well as your selves; and the only way you had to defend your selves against them, was without the authority of Scripture, to make your selves Judges both of the Scriptures and the Interpretation of them.

But he knows none that are so senseless to resolve all their Faith into the authority of the Church. I perceive he does not know Cardinal Bellarmin, whom he undertakes to justify, as any one would guess by his way of justifying him: let but the Romanists quit this Plea, that our Faith must be resolved into the Authority of the Church, and I shall not despair to see our other Disputes fairly ended.

For the Conclusion of the whole, I observed, That it is a most senseless thing to resolve all our Faith into the authority of the Church. — Whereas it is demonstrable, that we must know, and believe most of the Articles of the Christian Faith, before we can know, whether there be any Church or not. The order observed in the Apostles Creed is a plain evidence of this: for all those Articles which are before the Holy Catholick Church, must in order of nature be known before it.

This he grants, that *in order of Nature* all these Articles of the Creed concerning Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, must be known, before we can know a Church, but *to us the Church is most known:*
Which

Which is plain and down-right non-sense ; if by *most known*, he means *first known*, which is the present dispute ; for whatever by the order of nature must be known first, must be first known without any distinction. For we speak now not of the Methods of Learning, but of resolving our Faith into its first Principles, and that surely must follow the order of nature. If the belief of the Churches Authority be not in order of nature before the belief of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, it is a senseless thing to resolve our Faith into that, which though we should grant were the first cause of knowing these, yet is not the first principle in order of nature, into which Faith must be resolved. Children indeed, as he observes, must receive their Creed upon the Authority of their Parents, or of the Church, which is more known to them, than their Creed ; as all other Scholars must receive the first Principles of any Art or Science upon the authority of their Masters. But will you say, that the *Latin* Tongue is resolved into the authority of the School-master, because his Scholars in learning the *Latin* Tongue rely on his authority ? which yet is just as good sense as to say, that our Faith must be resolved into the authority of the Church, because the Church teaches Catechumens their Catechism, and they receive it upon the authority of their Parents, or Priests. And hence indeed he may conclude, that a young Catechumen knows his Teachers before he knows his Creed ; but to conclude that he knows a Church first, as that signifies a blessed Society, where Salvation is to be had, is a little

too much ; for that supposes that he knows the Church before he has learnt *Unam Sanctam Ecclesiam*, that is, before he has found the Church in the Creed ; which is great forwardness indeed.

If he does not speak of Children , but of Men-Catechumens , for such there were in the Primitive Church , and such he seems to speak of , when he says , *It is plain , that the Catechumen knew there was a Church , a blessed Society , where Salvation was to be had , before he would enter himself to be Catechised in the Faith.* I do not doubt, but such men did know the Church , before they submitted to the instructions of it ; but they knew Christ too, and believed in him , before they knew the Church. For they first believed in Christ , and then joyned themselves to that Society , which professed the Christian Faith, that they might be the better instructed in the Doctrines of Christianity ; that they might learn from the Church , what the Christian Faith is, and the reasons of it ; not that they would wholly resolve their Faith into Church-authority.

But I find by our Author , that the Creed was made only for Catechumens : For he says, *The first person used at the beginning of the Creed, I believe, signifies I, who desire to be made a member of the Church , by the Holy Sacrament of Initiation , do believe what hath been proposed to me first, and then comprehended in that Fundamental Breviate.*

What he designs by this, I cannot guess ; for still the Catechumen professes to believe in Father,

ther, Son, and Holy Ghost, before he believes the Holy Catholick Church. But pray, what does *I* signifie, when a Bishop, or Priest, or the Pope himself repeats the Creed ?

If, as he concludes, *We must believe Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, before we can compleatly determine the Church, and its definition*; he should have said, before we can know whether there be a Church or not, much less believe upon its authority, then indeed, as he says, *the Creed must begin with I believe in God*. But if our Faith must be resolved into the authority of the Church, as the Church of *Rome* teaches; and as these laborious endeavours of finding out a Church by extra-essential Notes supposes; then the Creed, as I said, ought to begin with, *I believe in the Holy Catholick Church, and upon the authority of this Church, I believe in God the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost*.

Thus I have with invincible patience particularly answered one of the most senseless Pamphlets that ever I read; and I hope it will not be wholly useles; for sometimes it is as necessary to expose non-sense as to answer the most plausible Arguments; though notwithstanding the mirth of it, I do not desire to be often so employed.

F I N I S

1 1 1 1 1

A
D E F E N C E
OF THE
C O N F U T E R
O F

BELLARMIN's Second Note of the Church,

A N T I Q U I T Y,
A G A I N S T T H E
C A V I L S of the A D V I S E R.


IMPRIMATUR,

May 31. 1687.

HEN. MAURICE.

L O N D O N :

Printed for **Ric. Chiswell**, at the *Rose and Crown* in
St. Paul's Church-yard, MDCLXXXVII.



*A Defence of the Confuter of Bellarmin's Second
Note of the Church, Antiquity, &c.*

I Apprehend by this Author's Genius, that 'tis much easier for some Men to write *Farce* than *Controversy*: And tho I cannot say whether or no any man ever undertook the Confutation of *Bellarmin* over a *Pot*, as our Author elegantly begins his Advice; yet he seems to me, by his ludicrous Behaviour, to have engaged in his Defence in that sort of humour. He may think it *Vanity*, if he pleases, in the Reverend and Learned Author of the Piece he attacks, to assail the *Roman Champion* himself; yet even I, who never enter'd the *Field of Controversy* before, shall presume to engage with such a *Smatterer* in the *Noble Science*, as his Second.

And yet, immediately after this fit of Rhetorick, he do's not pretend, that the *Pot*-qualifications are the case of him who has undertaken to answer *Bellarmin's Marks of the Church*. No, Why then do's he commence his Advice with such a Suggestion? Did he think fit to publish to the World, that he had a mind to be impertinent? An humour, especially in Conjunction with Buffoonry in serious Affairs, I would advise him against for the future, if the *powerful Influence of an ill habit* has not totally over-rul'd his Liberty in the matter.

And thus, after the witty Introduction to his *little good Will*; little enough, I dare say; we come now to receive the Advice of this grave controversial Counsellor, in the Case depending.

First, Then he pretends; (for I'll relate his Advice in short-hand, as much as I can, till I find something worth

the transcribing) that *Bellarmin* never meant what his Adversary undertakes to prove, *that the Plea of bare Antiquity is proper to the Church*: No! but this Gentleman must own that he did, when I have told him only, that by *bare Antiquity*, his Adversary understands Antiquity abstracted from the Consideration of Truth, those *Ancient Truths* deliver'd in the Scriptures. Now, I presume, he will not say, that *Bellarmin* any where expressly in his Book of Notes, muchless in this Chapter, makes the consent of Doctrines with the written Word, which is not *bare*, but *true Antiquity*, a Note of the Church; tho' indeed, such is the force of Truth, he can hardly keep off of that Argument. In his ninth Chapter, he makes agreement in Doctrine with the Ancient Church, a sixth Note of the Church: Ancient, he farther explains by Apostolic; telling us likewise out of *Tertullian*, that a Church is so call'd, as for other Reasons, so for her conspiring with the Apostles in their Doctrines; and yet, after all, most pitifully slides off to quite another thing, as will appear to any one who shall examine that Chapter.

But it may be almost worth a man's while to read the Adviser's Comment upon *Bellarmin's* Text, tho' I hate transcribing. *He says, indeed*, says my Author, *that whoever at this time will find out the Catholick Church, profess'd in the Creed, amongst so many pretenders, must not apply himself to any upstart Congregation, which was never visible in the World, but of late years; but to such a Church which has been of as long standing, as ever since Christ and the Apostles days, and consequently such a Church to which Antiquity of necessity at this time belongs.* This *Bellarmin* asserts.

Where I observe, First, that, by this last Expression, he Represents his own flourishing Gloss, as *Bellarmin's* Words, which they are not; a thing that looks a little towards a design of putting a trick upon his Readers. 2ly, That we are here shrewdly directed to find out the Catholick Church.

Church by finding out a particular, to which we must stick without farther enquiry. 3^{ly}, That this Man passes a *genera ad genus*, from Antiquity to *Visibility*, which the better Logick of his Master *Bellarmin* would not probably have suffer'd him to have done. And lastly, after all, that he unluckily says the same thing in substance, with what he disproves in his Adversary; for what do's all his Gloss amount to, but to this; That he who would find out the true Church, must overlook all such as boast not of Antiquity at all adventures, without any regard had to the true Antiquity of their Doctrines, or any thing else they pretend to; and pitch upon that, without any more ado, *which has been of as long standing*, (of as long standing barely, without any farther respect) as ever since Christ and the Apostles days? And what is such a *standing* as this, but *bare* Antiquity? Unless he can prove a necessary entail of Truth upon a long Succession, which all the World can never do. And therefore, hoping he may be a little more happy in following, than in giving Advice, I present him with his own, and the second he gives; That when he would confute his Adversary, he say not the same thing that he do's; and withal, desire him to attend, for the future, more diligently to the Sense, than to the Expression of a Period.

But wherein do's the Confuter of *Bellarmin* thus unluckily jump with him? Why, in explicating and proving the same Antiquity to be a Note of the Church, which *Bellarmin* affirms to be such. To which I answer, first, that if *Bellarmin* by Antiquity meant such as his Confuter explains, *p. 45.* as is pretended, then he understood by that word, an agreement in Doctrine with Christ and his Apostles, for so 'tis plain his Adversary meant; but we have shown before, that that could not be *Bellarmin's* Intention. 2^{ly}, That if the Cardinals Discourse upon this Note do's really tend to prove, not *Antiquity*, (but as the Confuter compendiously distinguishes, *Priority*) to belong to the Church, as it seems

to do; then 'tis demonstrable to me, that he presently grew weary of his Note, which he could not manage without blending and confounding it with another more proper and pertinent to his business, tho besides his design.

The third Inconsistency which he thinks he has found in the Confuter of *Bellarmin*, is this, That having prov'd *Antiquity* not to be a proper Note of the Church, because it did not always belong to it, as a proper Characteristick of a thing ought to do, there being a time when the Church was *new*, p. 42. He should, notwithstanding, in the 45 p. assert that the holy Scriptures are the *true Antiquity*, there being a time when they were *new* likewise; and here he thinks he has undoubtedly caught him. But alas, his Pen was more nimble than his thoughts were deep. If indeed *Bellarmin's* Adversary in this point had advanc'd this Proposition, That *Antiquity* is a *proper Note*, or *inseparable Property* of the Scriptures, or written Word, and had after this undertaken to prove, that *Antiquity* could not be such a Note of the Church, because the Church was once *new*; the Argument would with equal force have recoil'd upon that same Assertion of his in relation to the Scriptures. Or if *Bell.* had affirm'd only that the Church *is truly Ancient*, and his Adversary had denied it upon the Score of its former *newness*; he could not neither, if his own Objection were good, have rightly affirm'd that the Ss. are the *true Antiquity*: But who can discover the least repugnancy betwixt these two Assertions, that *Antiquity* is a *Note* of the Church, and consequently, as the Confuter well argues, proper to it, and inseparable from it, which yet cannot be true, if the Church was once *new*; and this, that the Scriptures are the *true Antiquity*; i.e. that the Doctrines deliver'd in the Scriptures or written Word, are the oldest and truest Doctrines in the Christian Church. Thus I have often observ'd, that a few plain Words will unriddle great Mysteries in appearance; and that some Men are unhappily apt to run away with a bare jingle of Words, instead of harmony in Sense.

In the fourth Remark we meet with no less a charge than that of a contradiction; and that's a bad business indeed in so narrow a compass of Pages; but where has this starter of difficulties espied it, for 'tis not easily discernable? Why, the Confuter of *Bellarmin* has asserted absolutely, p. 42. That Antiquity is not a proper note of the Church, whereas p. 45. *He has found out an Antiquity that is proper to the Church.* In good time! *Bellarmin* uses the word equivocally, either for that which is *ancient*, or for that which is *first*; the former his Confuter says, p. 42. is not a Note proper to the Church; but that the latter, which *Bellarmin* did not originally mean by his Note of Antiquity, tho he was forc'd to run into it, belongs to the Church. And is this now *ad idem*? and if not, where's the contradiction? If, discoursing with this Gentleman, I should own my self a Member of the Catholick Church, and finding afterwards that, according to their usual and presumptuous blunder, by the Catholick Church he meant the Roman Catholick Church, I should deny my self to be a Member of it, should I be guilty of a Contradiction? for shame what trifling is this? I thought some sort of People had better understood the dubious import of Words used *equivocally*.

His fifth Remark wants nothing but Truth to make it a very good one; and is this, That the Confuter of *Bellarmin* has produced a Citation out of *St. Cyprian*, which is so far from favouring his own Cause, that it really supports his Adversaries, and is the very ground of what they maintain, and he opposes. And in earnest then, amongst such great variety, he was very unhappy in his choice. But how does the Adviser make this appear? why, by two or three pert Interrogations, and that's all. To which if I opposed only as many more, I might reasonably seem to have given him a just Answer. For the place is so extremely pertinent to the Argument the Confuter was upon, that, for my own part, I can scarce perswade my self the Adviser

was .

was in earnest when he made his Remark, if he knew what he was about. The Confuter was showing, that bare Antiquity, as before explained, could not be a proper Criterion to judge of the true Church by, for that, amongst other Reasons, wicked Doctrines running down to Posterity, even from the Infancy of the Gospel, made use at length of the Plea of Antiquity to give them countenance and support ; which pretence, says he, was notwithstanding refuted by the Fathers in several remarkable Words. Amongst others of which he alledges that passage in St. Cyprian's Epistle to Pompeius. *Custom without truth is but Antiquity of error--- and there is a short way of Religious and simple minds to find out what is truth ; for if we return to the beginning and original of Divine Tradition, Humane Error ceases--- Thither let us return to our Lords Original, the Evangelical Beginning, the Apostolical Tradition, &c.* Is not now our Lord's Original, the Evangelical Beginning (terms synonymous with Apostolical Tradition) that ancient Truth the Confuter desires to appeal to? Or, is this, as the Adviser farther boasts, *That setting up the very Tradition which Catholicks appeal to?* Yes, says he. But why so? for no other reason doubtless but because he luckily espied the Word *Tradition* in that sentence, and perhaps found it under that head in his Common-place Book. Now seriously, if this Gentleman pleases, I'll produce him half an hundred Instances out of the Ancient Fathers, *Irenæus, Tertullian, Cyprian, &c.* where *Tradition* is used by them for the Scriptures, or written Word of God. If he had but consulted that other Epistle to *Cæcilius*, Cited by the Confuter in his Margent, he would have found it taken there five or six times in that very sense ; and that 'tis really so in the place now before us, is so demonstrably evident from the Epistle whence it is cited, that none who had ever consulted the Original, could with the least modesty, or judgment, have alledged it in Defence of Tradition, as stated in the Church of *Rome*. For the Holy

Holy Martyr refuting here what Pope *Stephen* had replied to him in a Letter concerning the Baptism of Hereticks, repeats several Passages of it. Of which this is one, *Si quis ergo a quacunq[ue] Hæresi venerit ad nos, nihil innovetur nisi quod Traditum est, ut manus illi imponatur in pœnitentiam.* To which St. Cyprian immediately replies, *Whence is this Tradition? does it descend from the Authority of our Lord and the Gospel, or from the Injunctions and Epistles of the Apostles? For God testifies, That those things are to be done which are written. If therefore it be commanded either in the Gospel, or in the Epistles of the Apostles, or in the Acts, that they who come from any Hæresie over to the Church, be not Baptized, but only have imposition of hands for repentance; let this Divine and Holy Tradition be observed. But if, &c.* And now what thinks our Adviser of St. Cyprian's *Apostolical Tradition*, which pleased him so wonderfully at first sight, and I dare say he never look'd farther? Are the *Gospels*, the *Epistles*, and the *Acts*, the only *Tradition* which Catholicks appeal to? Let him remember his *Trent-Creed*, and then tell me.

We come now, in the next place, to his Remarks and Advice in relation to the Confuter's second Proposition, That the present Church of *Rome* vainly pretends to true Antiquity, *i. e.* ancient Truth. And here we find him all on a sudden taken with a very strong fit of the Gentleman; he's upon his Punctilio's, and teaching his Adversary *better manners* than to charge the Church of *Rome* with *Lyes*; and yet this Master of Controversial Ceremonies is off of his breeding within two Pages after, where we have him ranking *the Divines and Disputants of the Church of England* with *honest Coblers and Tinkers*, as if they were really at a Club together over the *Pot* he speaks of in his Introduction, for the Confutation of *Bellarmin*; and, to instance no farther in this fulsome kind, what else is his whole scribble but one continued breach of *Good Manners and common Civiliey*, unless he thinks it the part of the Gentleman to Bofooon a whole Church, and all her Clergy? I shall

not farther recriminate, though I justly might, from several of their late Papers, were it worth the while. I shall only therefore tell him, that *Bellarmin* in that very Chapter we are now upon, gives his Adversaries the *Lye* twice very roundly; and why should he be angry with a man for copying after such an Original? And that I could wish some People were not so deeply concern'd in the Character of those who, in the Apostle's homely *Phrase*, shall in the latter times speak *Lyes* in Hypocrisy [1 *Tim.* 4. 2.] and by *lying Wonders* [2 *Thessl.* 2. 9.] impose upon the People, as to deserve such *plain English*. But the *Lye* deserves a Stab, they say, and therefore we may now expect a keen Pen, when pointed with such generous Resentments.

In the second place therefore he pretends, that the Confuter, in *kicking down the Church of Rome*, has *overthrown his own at the same blow*. For he having asserted, p. 49. [not, as the Adviser words it, *That the addition of Articles to the ancient Creed, takes of all claim to the ancient Truth*, as if a Church that coins new and false Articles of Faith, does thereby forfeit her Title to those true and ancient ones she before retain'd, though not impugn'd by these new ones, as the Adviser would suggest, but] that the present Church of *Rome*, having super-added several Articles of her own, contrary to several of those Christian Truths upon which she was originally founded, becomes another Church from what she was then, and cannot plead Antiquity for her present Constitution; the Adviser assumes, that neither then can the Church of *England* be the ancient Church, *who besides the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, has another of a later date, of nine and thirty Articles, besides another Plot-Creed call'd the Test*. Sure this Man wrote only to make People merry. Or, is he really not able to distinguish betwixt Articles of the Christian Faith, of necessity to be believ'd in order to Salvation, and such he cannot but know the Church of *Rome* accounts all the Articles of the new *Trent Creed*, and those of *Communion* and external agreement, which,

which, tho *ancient Truths*, (and if we cannot give better proofs of their *true Antiquity* than they can do of their necessary Articles, wee'l be content to lose them) are yet of an inferior Nature. And as to our *Plot-Creed* in particular, Ple set another *Plot-Creed* with a Witness against it; and that is, the *deposing Power*, by *Law establish'd*, by a Law that's a Creed in the strictest Sense to them, the Definition of a General Council; and had it not been for this, and other *Plot-Creeds* of absolving Subjects from their Allegiance, and the like, I am apt to believe they had never been troubled with ours.

In the next Paragraph the Adviser leads us such a Dance, there's no keeping Pace with him. He frisks and frolicks it so in his *Field of Controversy*, that he puts me in mind of the Diversion of another sort of Animal, lately come into a good Pasture, and in a warm Sun. I was in despair for some time of finding out his meaning in his long Ramble of two Pages, but beating about, for it laid in a very narrow compass, I found it at last in a Corner of the *Field of Controversy*; and 'tis in short, this, That the Confuter's Argumentation, which see p. 50. &c. do's not prove that when a *Change* or *Alteration* in Religion begins *publickly* to be *abetted*, *maintained* and *propagated*, &c.--*That then such an Alteration in Religion could spread it self over the whole Christian World, and yet the Authors, Promoters, Abettors, and Embracers of it, not be known, and taken notice of.* This being a popular, tho very weak refuge insisted upon by greater men than the Adviser, I shall give it a more distinct, tho short, Answer.

First, then I say, That the Confuter, p. 52. has given him one particular Instance of an *acknowledg'd Change*, of which they themselves cannot yet assign the Author by whom, nor the time when, it was introduc'd; and that he has farther, p. 53, &c. as much as his design'd Brevity would admit, evinc'd the Rise and Progress of two notorious changes in Religion, establish'd in the Church of *Rome*, and the Opposition they met with, and could at his pleasure have farther enlarg'd upon this Subject.

Now either of these *Ratiocinations* are a sufficient Confutation of *Bellarmin's*, adopted by the Adviser; And how little he has replied to his Instances, we shall see by and by.

2dly, He is mightily out in his Computation, unless the old blunder of the *Roman* being the Catholick Church, run still in his Head; if he thinks all those Doctrines of theirs, which we charge with the want of true Antiquity, were ever universally receiv'd *over the whole Christian World*, as he flourishes to exaggerate the Matter; What thinks he of one of the Confuter's instances, the Papal Authority, to go no further? But I hope his better Knowledge in this point will supersede me the labour of enlarging upon so copious an Argument.

3dly, I must tell the Adviser, that the Doctrines we complain of, being generally such as are calculated for the Meridian of *Rome*, the greater Veneration, Wealth, and Grandeur of the Pope and his Clergy; 'tis no wonder at all that we hear not of so much Bustle and Noise about them in the *Western World*, as we might otherwise have expected. And if he asks me, as he's good at such silly questions, *Where the Church of England was all this time, and why She did not Preach, and make Laws against such Corruptions and their Abettors*; I presume to ask his Wisdom again, *Where She was under the late Reign of Cromwel, and why She did not Preach and make Laws against him and his Abettors.*

Why truly She was, in both Cases, under the invincible Tyranny of an Usurper; and therefore, methinks, the general Answer of the Houholder to his Servants, asking him whence came the tares, that an Enemy had Sown them, might satisfie in this Anti-type of the Parable likewise; especially, since we find neither Master nor Servants any farther solicitous in particular Enquiries about them, even when they grew up, and were consequently *seen and discern'd*; for ill weeds to be sure grow fast enough. And I shall only in this place, desire the Gentlemen, who are so ready to boast of the present Continuance of the discriminating Doctrines of the Church of *Rome*, notwith-

notwithstanding the Opposition they have met with, to make this farther Remark with me upon the Parable of the Tares, *That they were suffer'd to grow up with the Wheat until the Harvest*, and let them recollect what became of them then.

4thly, Were there no other method for Errors to spread in the Church, than by what the Adviser seems to Dream of, *by appearing in open Contradiction and Defiance to the true Church, condemning its Doctrine, and opposing the Articles of her Faith, as Erroneous and Heretical*, as he tragically expresses it; then his inference might probably hold good, unless we will suppose such Errors to have appear'd in a very dark and supine Age indeed, and even in a more cautious, 'tis possible Records might be lost; but alas, since they usally grow up and advance after a quite different manner, *pedetentim*, by little and little, as *Fisher* Bishop of *Rocheſter* owns the Doctrine of Purgatory did; or, it may be under the Colour of greater Piety and Devotion, or the like, as the Doctrines of Image and Saint-worship, and thereby draw in the Pastors of the Church themselves for their *Maintainers* and *Abettors*; his Argumentation falls to the Ground.

5thly, He ought to distinguish betwixt such Errors, as immediately confront the prime Foundations of the Christian Faith, and that Apostasy the Spirit hath foretold should be brought in by such as speak lies in Hypocrisy, [*1 Tim. 4. 1, 2.*] of the first sort were the early Heresies, concerning the Person of our Saviour, His Divinity and Humanity, The Resurrection of the Body, and the like; such as these indeed did not, nor cannot well be suppos'd to appear in the Church without a mark upon the time of their rise, their *Authors* and open *Embracers*. The other is a mystery of Iniquity, and may be advanc'd by specious and almost imperceptible methods, as is hinted above, without any great stir or din about them.

6thly, To the single Instance of the Confuter concerning an acknowledg'd change, the rise whereof they themselves cannot account for, the half Communion, I shall add two more, the
Doctrines

Doctrines of Purgatory and Indulgences, both own'd by *Fisher* Bishop of *Rocheſter*, and Cardinal *Cajetan*, to be of uncertain Original; thereby acknowledging them not to be of the number of thoſe *Ancient Truths* we contend for, and yet are not able to tell who firſt brought them in. To his two Inſtances of *Alteration* in Religion, the Papal Authority, and the worſhip of Images, which we can account for according to the Advifer's Directions, I add one more; The great Burning Article of Tranſubſtantiation; whoſe Riſe, Progreſs and Oppoſers, they have lately been told of, [*See Diſc. againſt Tranſubſt.*] remitting the Advifer to *Polydore Virgil* for farther Inſtruction in this matter, if he deſires it. After all which, I muſt farther preſume briefly to remind him of the ſeveral new Definitions of the *Trent* Council, and of others, which from Doctrines formerly taught, ſprang up preſently, in that proliſtick Soil of Religion, into Articles of Faith; and ſure 'tis a conſiderable *Alteration in Religion*, to make the belief of Points neceſſary to Salvation, which were not ſo before. And yet I hope we are able to name the *who*, the *where*, and the *when*, of thoſe Alterations. But

Laſtly, I muſt tell the Advifer, that, tho out of complaiſance to him and his Betters, I have ſo far enlarg'd upon this Argument; yet, as ſtated by himſelf, with reference to the *publick Appearance* of Corruptions; 'tis answer'd in one word, by the ſame curt Ratiocination as it was before, when conſider'd with Relation to their *firſt riſe* only. For, tho we could give no account of the *open Maintainers*, *Embracers* and *Abettors*, nor of the *Oppoſers* of any Doctrine or Practice prevailing in the preſent Church of *Rome*; yet, if we are able to demonſtrate that ſuch Doctrine or Practice manifeſtly differs from what was at firſt eſtabliſh'd in the Church by Chriſt and his Apoſtles; or going yet farther, can ſhow out of unqueſtionable Records, that no ſuch thing, as for inſtance, the preſent Papal Authority, was ever own'd in the Church for ſuch a time, 600 years for example; do's it not inevitably follow,
That

That a change however has been made, both from the *true Antiquity*, the Scriptures, and the subordinate Antiquity of so many Centuries of the Church, tho we could not name the place where, the time when, and the Persons by whom, such Corruptions were publickly maintained and abetted ? I can scarce, for my own part, believe that men are in earnest, when they oppose such a wretched piece of Sophistry to the unanswerable argument of matter of Fact, and the plainest experience in the World.

We come now to his Remark upon the Confuter's instance of Communion in one kind, and his advice to him here is, to prove in his next, *That a diversity of practise is an alteration in Religion; and especially of such a practise, which Christ left indifferent in respect of the Laity, and without any positive command of their receiving it in both kinds.* But since he has not thought fit to prove this at all, which was his proper province in this place, unless by two or three frivolous Citations, of which afterwards; I shall still take the contrary for granted, being well assured, first, That he can show no positive command to the Clergy to receive it in both kinds, which does not equally include the Laity; and, secondly, That they, being equally interested with the Clergy in the benefits that accrue to mankind from the effusion of our Saviour's Blood, and the Sacrament of the Eucharist being instituted in Commemoration of this effusion of his Blood, as well as of the breaking of his Body; the drinking of the Cup, as well as the eating of the Bread, becomes as necessary a part of this Sacrament, in relation to the Laity, as it is to the Clergy; they who equally partake of the benefits of both, being equally concern'd in the Commemoration of both. And a thousand years constant practice accordingly, is a good exposition of our Saviour's Design in the institution; and can then *the refusing the Cup* to the Laity be called a *diversity of Practice* only of *administering it* to them ? Or, is the *abolishing* of a practice (of such Divine Authority, and of so long a continuance in the Universal

Universal Church) in relation to such Myriads of People, only a differing *modus* of *exercising* it ? A familiar Instance will illustrate the matter, though it seems sufficiently to discover it self by its own natural absurdity. Suppose then some friend of the Advisers should, by his last Will and Testament, leave to much Beer, and so much Bread, to be distributed every Week, for instance, to the Poor of the Parish where he had lived ; and the Adviser, his Executor, should, for a long time, take care to have both the Beer and the Bread faithfully distributed according to the Testator's Will ; but yet, at last, for some private reason of his own, should deprive them of their portion of Beer, and confine them to Bread only ; does he imagine he could sham off the World, and the Poor People concern'd, with this piece of Sophistry, That what he did was only a *diversity of Practice* in fulfilling the Will of the Deceased, and no *alteration* of the Will it self ? Who sees not, at first sight, the illusion of such an evasion ? But now because the Adviser counsels the Confuter to prove in his next, That a *diversity of Practice*, as he pleasantly calls the denial of the Cup, is an *alteration in Religion* ; I'll endeavour to do it for him, in as few words as I can, now that I am upon the spot, and save him the labour. For, if the Sacrament of the Eucharist be a part of the Christian Religion, and I hope 'twill be granted to be a very considerable one, and the Cup an essential part of that Sacrament ; then they who deprive the Laity of the Cup, the *diversity of Practice* here spoke of, make thereby an alteration in Religion ; but, &c. And I'll make good this Argumentation to him when he pleases. The custom of administering the Cup with Water only instead of Wine, was not, I hope, so great a *diversity of Practice*, as not administering the Cup at all to the Laity, who were at that time partakers of the Cup, such as it was ; and yet it were worth his while to read what stress St. Cyprian, in his 63 *Ep.* to Cæcilius, lays upon the *practice* of our Lord in his Institution of this Sacrament. And, in a word, so far is this defrauding the Laity

of the Cup, from being no *alteration in Religion*, that, besides what has been said, it opens wide the Door to the greatest *alterations* imaginable. For, if the Church, nay, what is worse, the Church of *Rome* in particular, can, by her own transcendent Prerogative, *alter* and *act* contrary to this positive Law and Institution of Christ, she may, by the same reason, dispence with, or formally abrogate any of the other at her pleasure. As for his Quotations out of *Luther* and *Melancthon*, I have not been able to find, upon a pretty diligent search, as much as the very Tract and Epistles from whence he cites them, and therefore am apt to imagine, that taking them up at second hand, he, or his Author, made a mistake in them. However it be, it matters not much; for his second Citation out of *Luther* appears, at first sight, so foreign to his purpose, that by it we may guess at the rest. But above all, recommend me to the Skull which could Cite that place of *Spalatenfis*, l. 5. c. 6. for the refusal of the Cup; or conclude, that because private Persons, upon *extraordinary* occasions, as want of Wine, antipathy to it, or the like, mentioned by this very Author, may lawfully receive in one kind, the Church may make an universal standing Law against the Laity's receiving in both. Give me leave but just to continue the words of *Spalatenfis*, where the Adviser leaves off, and you will be sufficiently able to pronounce of either the judgment or ingenuity of this Author, without any farther descant upon him. After having told us then in the general, in what cases the Sacrament may be lawfully received under the species of Bread alone, he proceeds, *Though in such a case*, says he, *the Sacrament is not truly and properly whole. Wine may either be wanting, or the Person abstemious; or, it may be more convenient to receive at home, than in the Church, upon a lawful cause, in which case a man may carry the Bread along with him, tho not so conveniently the Wine, as old examples teach us* (a practice perhaps not altogether warrantable in the Church) *But the Church neither could, nor can, by an universal Law deprive the Laity of the Cup,*

C

whether

whether they will or no, upon no necessity at all; for what Christ granted to all men, is in vain denied by the Church; and where the whole Sacrament may and ought to be exhibited, it cannot be mutilated and halſed without the greateſt juſtice; and this is expreſſy prohibited under an Anathema by Gelafius in a Canon of the Church.

In the next Paragraph, the Adviſer is all upon the ramble again, and you ſcarce know where to have him; I'll pick up the ſenſe tho' he has dropt here and there, and digeſt it for him as well as I can. Firſt, Then he is angry with the Conſuter for dateing the riſe of the Papal Authority he ſpeaks of, ſo far back as Pope *Victor*; and his reaſon is, *becauſe the Church of Rome is generally believ'd to have been in thoſe days pure and uncorrupt*. Here wants nothing but a good conſequence. The Faith of the Church of *Rome* was then ſound and Orthodox, and therefore one of her Biſhops could not be of a warm, paſſionate, or aſſuming temper, as *Africans* generally are, of which Country he was; and, by an unwarrantable action, undeſignedly perhaps, lay the firſt Foundation of a future encroachment and uſurpation. This is the whole Logic of the Buſineſs. But, the praſtiſes the Conſuter cenſures, were *own'd by the Chriſtians of thoſe days*. I wonder then he did not ſhow the vanity of what the Conſuter alledges concerning the reprimand that *Celeſtine* met with from the *African* Biſhops upon his intrusion into their Affairs; or, to go farther back, did the Adviſer never hear of the buſtle that *Victor's* excommunicating the *Aſiatic* Biſhops made in the Church? Or was no Body ever ſo kind as to tell him how ill that action was reſented by Biſhops of the *Latin* Church it ſelf; as may appear from a fragment of a Letter of *Irenæus*, Biſhop of *Lyons*, to *Victor* upon this occaſion? [ſee *Euseb. Hiſt. l. 5. c. 24.*] But, Secondly, Pope *Victor's* praſtiſe could be no other than an *Apoſtolic truth*, *becauſe he lived in the Second Century*. I thought we ſhould have him upon the Argument of *bare Antiquity*, for all his former indignation at the Conſuter for telling

ling him 'twas *Bellarmin's* second Note of the Church; and here again is nothing but the poor business of a little Logic, and conclusiveness wanting. For the argument proves too much, and so proves nothing at all to his purpose, being that which *a fortiori* will justify the Treachery of *Judas*, and all the Heretical Doctrines that were broach'd before *Victor's* time. But I need not farther expose its absurdity, the Confuter having done it so excellently well in his first particular. His third appearance of reason, is, that the Popes the Confuter mentions as beginners of the present Innovation of the Papal Authority, living before or in the time of the four first General Councils, if what is pretended were true, those Councils would have taken notice of it. Now because he confines his observation to those Councils only, so shall I do my answer, which need be no other than this, That the Innovation was then perfectly in its Infancy; the Tares as yet, according to his own distinction, in the dark and under ground, not grown up, and overtopping the Corn, as they did afterwards, and therefore difficultly perceptible, at least in their future fatal tendency and event; and as such might, consequently, easily escape the severe and solemn Animadversion of a general Council. But can the Adviser imagin, that if the Bishops of *Rome* had, in those days, presumed to have broke down all the ancient mounds and boundaries of Jurisdiction, the *πατριάρχης* of the Council of *Nice*, and had, in a word, but offer'd at such an audacious attempt as an universal Monarchy over the whole Church of Christ, that they would not have been taken notice of by those Councils, as they were by others afterwards, and by the *African* Bishops during that time? Yes, he may assure himself we should have had a brand of Infamy set upon them, that would have lasted to all Posterity, if any but the Church of *Rome* had the keeping of the Records. But there's something behind still in this Paragraph, which looks, as if he were fond of it; & therefore we must do it the civility of a remark; and that is, *that the ancient Fathers urge the con-*

*tinued succession of these very Bishops of Rome, as an Argument of the True Orthodox Faith and Religion professed in that Church. Ergo, What? What you please. I have told this Gentleman before, that the Orthodoxy of the Faith of the Church of Rome in those days is no way concern'd in the present debate; for the Church over which the Bishops we speak of, presided, might be found in the Faith; for the Pope's universal Jurisdiction was then no Article of it; and yet they, through passion, inadvertency, or perhaps natural ambition, lay the first Foundation of that monstrous Fabric of Papal power, that after-Ages built upon it. I shall not here enter upon a Discourse concerning the proof of the Truth of Doctrines by succession of Bishops, because the Adviser uses it only as a *Medium* to prove, tho' poor man he has made but bad use of it, that no Bishop of *Rome* could by any means sow those Seeds, which might be afterwards improv'd into dangerous innovations; yet, I must tell him that, after all, those Fathers *ultimately* resolve the truth of all Doctrines into their harmony and agreement with the Apostolic writings. The ridiculous Buffoonry that fills up the rest of the Paragraph, sufficiently exposes its Author, of it self; only whereas he tells us, we have no other way to look *fair*, than by *blackning* the Church of *Rome*; I must tell him in return, That, in my Mind, they are equally impertinent who would wash an *Æthiopian* white, and who would paint him blacker than he is.*

In the next Paragraph about Image-worship, he palliates very finely, as if Paint and Varnish were still as requisite to a Discourse upon that indefensible Subject, as to the Subject it self. The Confuter hinting briefly to him by what advances Image-worship crept up to that height, wherein 'tis now taught and practic'd in the Church of *Rome*, begins as he ought, from the very first Steps, or unhappy Occasions only, of that religious Worship that was afterwards given them; *viz.* the *Historical* use of them 300 years after Christ, improv'd into the *Rhetorical*, as he well expresses it, in 300 years more after that. Now upon
this

this fastens the Adviser, without ever taking notice of the Religious Adoration that is paid them, that great *Alteration of Religion* the Confuter complains of, and of which the former uses of them were only unhappily Introductory; but flurs it over in the general terms of *other Reasons*; others with a witness, for which the Confuter *condemns the Church of Rome of Innovation in Religion*. Is this Ingenuity? Is this Arguing? But alas, 'tis as good as the Cause will bear. How then is the *Church of England laid upon her back* by the Alteration in Religion, which the Confuter in this place charges upon the Church of *Rome*? Do's the Church of *England* worship Images? If not, She can never be in the same Condemnation, for not worshipping, with that Church, which doth worship them. But here perhaps lies the Mystery; Mr. *Mountague*, in the 21. Chap. of his Appeal to *Cæsar*, approves of the giving them [*Civil*] *Respect and Reverence, as was done by Pope Gregory in Remembrance, and more effectual Representment of the Prototype*; all which amounts to no more, even in his own Exposition in that Chap. than to a bare *Historical* use of them; And what of all this? Do's it hence follow that the whole Church of *England* is equally *laid on her Back* with the Church of *Rome*, that religiously worships them? Is there no difference betwixt Mr. *Mountague's* private Opinion, and the Doctrine of the Church of *England*? No difference betwixt a meer *Historical*, and that *Religious* use that is made of them in the Church of *Rome*? Well, but Mr. *Mountague* confesses that the *Historical* and *Rhetorical* uses of them, are allow'd by the Church of *England*. And suppose so for once; what becomes of the poor Consequence still, for that's what I am concern'd for? The Church of *England* allows an use of Images harmless in it self, and therefore She is equally culpable with a Church that allows, nay commands, an use of them, sinful in it self. Consequences so big with Absurdity, that a man needs but name them, to expose them. But after all, the Church of *England* has no such Doctrine that I know of, nor do's Mr. *Mountague* say so. He says indeed, Chap 20. that we

do

do not account the Papists Idolatrous for these Historical and Rhetorical uses of them; and in the same Chap. that it is not the Doctrine of the Church of *England* to have departed from the Church of *Rome* about this point, if She had gone no farther in Practice nor Precept than what St. *Gregory* recommended; and that he, for his part, could have actually gone thus far along with them: But he affirms no such thing of the Church of *England*, as the Adviser would make him. But, since he has been pleas'd to make use of Mr. *Mountague's* Name, as a sort of an Abetter of their Doctrine in this Point: I think I cannot do Him, nor the Reader, greater Justice, than here to give a Specimen of his Sense of this *Doctrine and Practice* of the Church of *Rome*. Thus, then, says he in the 19. Chap. one of those cited by our Author. *I do not, I cannot, I will not deny that Idolatry is grossly committed in the Church of Rome. The ruder sort at least are not excusable, who go to it with down-right Idolatry, without any relative Adoration, worshipping that which they behold with their Eyes. This Idolatry is Ancient in their Schools, as he there shews; not amongst the Vulgar only.*

The little Flourishes which follow, are not worth a remark; for who says, That such an use of Images, as he there speaks of, *leaves the Church of Rome without all title to Antiquity*, or, that it *Unchurches* her? This I am sure is a *Rhetorical* use of words, instead of a *Logical* one, which obliges a Disputant to keep to his terms; a strictness, alas, that will never agree with thin Sense, and a bad Cause. The Confutation of his Comparison betwixt the Introduction of the worship of Images, and *Lawn-sleeves, &c.* I leave to the Laughter or Indignation of every Reader, as he is in Humour, when he meets with it; for he who would vouchsafe such stuff any other Reply, might justly be thought guilty of as great trifling in refuting, as he in advancing it.

His Remarks upon the Confuter's Conclusion, are a pure Declamation, and I have no great appetite to encounter a School-Boys Exercise. He tells us, *He cannot possibly make sense of what the Confuter says in reference to the Church of England,*

land, *That her Religion, by Law established, is the true Primitive Christianity*; for so run his Words; and what then? Is the Confuter bound to find him in understanding? He might have enough to do at that rate. I thought he had explain'd himself in the next Page, and that very pertinently too, by telling him, That our Religion is as old as Christ and his Apostles, with whom whosoever agrees, they are truly *ancient Churches*, tho of no longer standing than yesterday : As they that disagree with them, are *new*, tho they can run up their Pedigree to the very Apostles; and this he farther confirms by *Tertullian's* Authority. Now if the Adviser had had a mind, or ability, to have spoke pertinently to the matter in hand, he should have endeavour'd to have shewn, either, that Conformity with Primitive and Apostolic Doctrine does not make a Church truly Ancient and Apostolic ; or, that the Doctrines of the Church of *Engl.* have no such Conformity ; for if they have, 'twill be found that Christ and his Apostles *have a greater hand* in the Constitution of this Church, than in that of *Rome*, notwithstanding his trifling harangue to the contrary. *The World knows very well*, he tells us, *when this Church was first establish'd by Law* ; and so does the World know too, when Christianity was first seated in the Throne, and protected by the secular arm, and yet I believe the Christians of those days thought no worse of their Religion for that ; nor, I believe, would the Adviser think worse of his, if the Laws were on its side. *But where this Church was before 'twas establish'd by Law, that is not so easie to tell.* Why, truly in my mind, 'twas much in the same state with the *Jewish Church* under the Dominion of *Pharoah* in *Ægypt* ; the one being born down and enslaved by a Temporal Tyranny ; the other by both a Temporal and Spiritual Usurpation ; till God was pleased, as to rescue the one, so the other too, out of the House of Bondage. After this, he whistles and plays about the *separation and novelty* of this Church. To which I shall only return ; That if he pleases to be but so kind to himself and to us, as to lay aside the

the

the Buffoon and Declamator for a while, and condescend, for once, to speak to the purpose, upon that, or any other subject; he needs not fear a suitable reply from some or other. In the last place, he is for finding out the Confuter some work, in Relation to the proof of our adequate belief of the Creed, *and in the same sense, in which it was taught by the Apostles, and professed by the Primitive Church.* No man, who knows the Reverend and Learned Confuter, can doubt of his Abilities for a much harder Task than what the Adviser would set him; but I presume he knows how to dispose of his time much better than to lay it out in refuting the Suggestions of every incompetent Adversary; and since he has thought fit to sling out this Surmise about the belief of the Church of *England*; in my Apprehension 'twould much more become him to make it out in the first place, and then, perhaps he may hear of the Confuter, if he chances to write any thing worth his Confutation.

He tells us, in one place, of the forwardness of the *beardless Divines* of the Church of *England*. I must confess I know not whether the Down is still upon his own Chin, or no; but if not, I must needs tell him, that for ought I find in his friendly *half Sheet of Paper*, the Beard contributes no more to the making of the *Divine*, than it do's to the making of the *Philosopher*; and therefore, I shall conclude with one piece of Advice to him, and that which may do him more true Service than all he has given the Confuter can ever do him, and that is, That, if it be really his hard fate not to be able to write more to the purpose, than what he has hitherto done, he would give over writing in this kind, and for the future follow the bent of his Genius, which seems to lead him rather to the Comical Humour of the Stage, than into the *Field of Controversy*.

T H E
C O N T E N T S
Of the following
N O T E S.

The INTRODUCTION to the
Notes of the Church.

THE *Visibility* of the *Catholick Church* takes away the *Necessity* of finding out *Notes* to distinguish it by, especially of such *Notes* as are matter of *Dispute* themselves. p. 3.

The *Use* of *Notes* to find out an *Infallible Church*, and these appropriated by the *Cardinal* to the *Church* of *Rome* only. p. 4.

What *Protestants* intend in those *Notes* they give of the true *Church*, and what the *Papists* by their *Notes* of a *Church*. p. 5.

The *Protestant Way* of finding out the *Church* by the *essential Properties* of a true *Church*. p. 6.

Three things objected to this by the *Cardinal*, and *Answers* returned. p. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12.

The Cardinal's Way considered and examined,

1st. To find out which is the *True Church* before we know what a *True Church* is. p. 13.

Two *Enquiries* in order of *Nature* before which is the *True Church*, whether there be a *True Church* or not? and what it is. ibid.

No *Notes* of these, but such as they dare not give, viz. the *Authority* of the *Scriptures* and every *Man's* private *Judgment* of the *Sense* and *Interpretation* of them. p. 14.

2ly, She gives us *Notes* whereby to find out the *True Catholick Church*, before we know
A

The CONTENTS.

know what a particular Church is. p. 15.

Impossible to know what the Catholick Church is, before we know what a particular Church is. ibid.

No other Notes of a True Church, but what belongs to every True particular Church, and that can be nothing but what is essential to a Church, and what all Churches do agree in, viz, the true Faith and Worship of Christ. p. 16.

The 6th (which is the same with the 2d) and the 8th are the chief, if not the only Notes of this Nature, and here our Claim is as good, if not better than theirs. ibid.

His 9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th not properly Notes of a True Church, any otherwise than as they are Testimonies of the common Christianity, which is professed by all true Churches. ibid.

The 13th, 14th, 15th, no Notes at all, because they are not always true. ibid.

His 3d and 4th Notes are not Notes of a Church, but only God's Promises made to his Church. p. 17.

His 1st Note doth not declare what a Church is, but in what Communion it is, and is no Note of a true Church, unless it be first proved, that they are true Churches, which are

in Communion with each other. ibid.

His 5th, common to the Greek, and any other Church, who have Bishops in Succession from the Apostles, or Apostolical Bishops. p. 18.

The 7th Note serves to purpose the Cardinal's Design, and doth his Business without any other Note. ibid.

3dly. Another Mystery in forming these Notes, is to pick out of all the Christian Churches in the World one Church, which we must own for the Catholick Church, and reject all others, as Heretical, or Schismatical, or Uncatholick Churches, who refuse Obedience and Subjection to this one Catholick Church. p. 19.

That there is but one True Church in the World, and that the Catholick Church doth not signify all the particular True Churches, but some one Church, which all others are bound to submit to, and communicate with, if they will be Members of the Catholick Church: this necessary to be proved before the Cardinal had given us these Notes of a Church. p. 20, 21.

4thly. Another Design in making these Notes, is to find out such a Church on whose Authority we must rely for the whole Christian Faith, e-

The CONTENTS.

ven for the Holy Scriptures themselves. p. 22.
But here we must first be satisfied that the True Church is Infallible; this can never be proved but by Scripture, which a Man must first believe, before it can be proved to him,

that there is an Infallible Church. p. 23.
The Church is not the first Object of our Faith in Religion, since we ought to know and believe most of the Articles of the Christian Faith, before we can know whether there be any Church or no. p. 23, 24.

The Contents of the First NOTE, CATHOLICK.

THE sincere Preaching of the Faith or Doctrine of Christ, as it is laid down in the Scripture, is the only sure and infallible Mark of the Church of Christ. p. 25.

The Church of Rome declines being examined by this Rule.

p. 26.

Bellarmin's Argument for the Name Catholick being an undoubted true Mark of a True Church.

p. 26.

The Weakness of the Cardinal's Argument exposed in three Particulars.

- I. In what respect the Name Catholick was esteemed by some of the Fathers in their Time, a Note of a Catholick Church, and in what respects 'twill ever be a standing Note of it. p. 27.

This shewn to be upon the account of the Catholick Faith, and therefore in their time is joined with the Word Catholick.

p. 28.

What the Catholick Faith, and why called Catholick? ibid.

None in the first Ages of Christianity went by the Name of Catholick, but those who profess the true Catholick Faith:

p. 29.

- II. No Argument can be drawn from the bare Name of Catholick to prove a Church to be Catholick.

p. 29.

- I. The Christian Church was not known by the Name Catholick at the Beginning, though of an ancient and early Date, and therefore no essential Note of it. p. 30.

The CONTENTS.

2. *Names are oft times arbitrary, and at random, and falsely imposed on things, and therefore nothing can be concluded from them.* *ibid.*
3. *Names are oft times imposed on things as Marks of Distinction only, without any further Design of lessening their Natures and Qualities by them.* *p. 31.*
4. *It does not follow, that because the Name Catholick in that time when it was for the most part conjoined with the Catholick Faith, was a sure Note of a true Church, it must always be so even when the Name and the Thing are parted.* *p. 32.*
The worst of Hereticks laid claim to it. *p. 33.*
The Rule to know the True Church by, proved from Lactantius and St. Austin. *ibid.*
5. *It doth not follow, that because the being called after the Names of particular Men in that Age, when all so called were for the most part corrupt in the Faith, was a sure Hand of Schismatics and Hereticks, that it must always be so.*

p. 33, 34.

III. *The Church of Rome having egregiously corrupted the Catholick Faith or Religion, neither is, nor deserves the Name of a*

Catholick Church. *p. 34.*
This justified by comparing her Doctrine in several Points, with that delivered by Christ and his Apostles. *p. 35.*
For Instance, that Angels and Saints are to be prayed unto and worshipped, this contrary to Scripture. *ibid.*
The worshipping of Images contrary to the second Commandment, which they make the same with the first. *p. 36.*
The Scripture commands all Persons indifferently to read the Scriptures, the Church of Rome allows not this Liberty to the Laity, but upon License. *ibid.*
The Scriptures forbid Prayers in an unknown Tongue, and the Church of Rome enjoins such and no other. *p. 37.*
Purgatory contrary to Scripture. *ibid.*
The denying the Cup to the Laity contrary to the express Institution of our Saviour. *p. 38.*
The Scripture saith that the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament, even after Consecration, is Bread and Wine; the Church of Rome says the Bread and Wine is Transubstantiated into the natural Body and Blood of Christ. *p. 39.*
The Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass according to the Scrip-

The CONTENTS.

ture derogatory to Christ's own Priestly Oblation; whereby he once offered himself a compleat Sacrifice of Expiation.

P. 40.

In all these Particulars the Church of Rome, a Corrupter of the Christian Faith and Doctrine, and consequently deserves not the name of Catholick. ibid

The Second Note, A N T I Q U I T Y.

THis Mark and Character of a true Church is not proper to the Church of Rome alone, nor in truth doth it belong to it. To prove this three things are here offered.

- I. That the Plea of bare Antiquity is not proper to the Church, but common to it with other Societies, of false Religion.

P. 41.

The Notes of a thing must be proper to that of which they are a Note, and not common to it with other things. p. 42.

1. Because what is proper to a thing is inseparable from it, and did ever belong to it since it had a being, and can at no time be absent from it. ibid.

2. Other Societies have laid claim to this Note, and it could not be denied them,

and therefore no proper Note of a Church. ibid.

This shews that bare Antiquity cannot be a Note of Truth.

P. 44.

Antiquity and Priority widely different.

P. 45.

A twofold Antiquity; one in respect of us, the other absolute and in it self. ibid.

The Church of Rome will not be tried only by the Scriptures, which is the true Antiquity.

P. 46.

Error almost as ancient as Truth for which reason several wicked Doctrines, running down to Posterity, have made use of the plea of Antiquity, to give them countenance and support.

P. 47.

- II. The present Church of Rome vainly pretends to true Antiquity, i.e. to ancient Truth.

P. 48.

Wherein

The CONTENTS.

Wherin true Antiquity doth consist. ibid.

The present Church of Rome not ancient, by reason of that alteration they have made in the ancient Creed. p. 49.

Cardinal Bellarmin's Ratiocination against this charge consisting of 6 things to be observed in all Changes of Religion, none of which (he says) can be shewn in the Church of Rome, since the Apostles time. ibid.

His reasoning built upon very false grounds, this considered and largely answered in four Particulars. p. 50.

1. *As being contrary to all History and Experience, there having been great Changes in Religion, the Authors and the beginnings, &c. of which cannot be known.* p. 50.

2. *Neither do the Examples they alledge for this their reasoning serve to no other purpose but to shew the falseness of it, as in the case of the Nestorian and Arrian Heresies.* p. 51.

3. *Supposing them true, they would uphold the greatest Impieties.* ibid.

The Heav'n Gods and their Oracles supported by this Argument. p. 52.

4. *The Roman Church it self an instance of this, there being an acknowledg'd change in it, and yet they cannot tell who first began it, viz. Communion in one kind.* ibid.

Two instances out of Polydore Virgil, when and by whom they were brought into the Church of Rome. p. 53.

1. *Their grand Article of Faith the Papal Authority, brought in by Victor, and carried on by the following Bishops.* ibid.

The present Definitions of the Catholick Church, and the Power of the Pope to depose Kings not challenged till Gregory VII. i.e. 1000 Years after Christ. ibid.

2. *It is known when Images crept into the Church.* p. 55.

A little more than 100 Years since unwritten Traditions were decreed to be a part of the Rule of Faith, i. e. of the Word of God. ibid.

III. *That the Religion of the Church of England by Law established, is the true Primitive Christianity.* p. 56.

The Third Note, D U R A T I O N.

Thrce things are here considered.

I. What is to be understood by the term Duration. p. 58.

Duration includes 3 things.

1. A Being of a Church from the beginning.
2. The continuance of that Church to the end.
3. The continuance of that Church from the beginning to the end without interruption. p. 58

Bellarmino's Application of the first of these to the Church of Rome yet deficient in the latter Branches. p. 59.

II. How far Duration is a Note of the true Church. p. 59.

This is no Note by which a true Church is to be found out or distinguished from the false. *ib.* For four Reasons.

1. The nature of the thing will not permit that it should be a Note. p. 60.
2. That cannot be a Note of the true Church which doth not inseparably belong to the Church in all seasons and cases. p. 61.

3. That which is a Note must be proper to the thing, which it is the Note of, and not common to other things as well as that. p. 61, 62. Common to false Churches as well as true. *ibid.*

4. If it be a Note of a true Church, then those could not be true Churches, which have not had that Duration. *ib.* This unchurches the 7 Churches of Asia. p. 62, 63.

III. The Church of Rome hath no just and sufficient title to this Character. p. 63.

This proved as to

1. Place	{ these being the things,
2. Persons	
3. Order	
4. Doctrine	

by which a Church doth exist and is made visible. p. 63, 64. Rome not always the principal Seat of the Church. p. 63. Avignon was for 70 Years where the Pope and the whole Court resided. *ibid.* Several Popes Hereticks. p. 64. Two Popes at once contending for the Chair, and this for above 40 Years together; and at one time 3 Popes. p. 64. The

The CONTENTS.

<i>The Church of Rome compared with it self in reference to several Doctrines.</i>	p. 65.	<i>Indulgences.</i>	ibid.
<i>What the Church of Rome now holds, and what the Church of Rome hath held.</i>	ibid.	<i>Purgatory.</i>	p. 68.
<i>Her being the Mother-Church, and the Pope being Christ's Vicar.</i>	ibid.	<i>Prayers in an unknown Tongue.</i>	ibid.
<i>Concerning the Apocryphal Books.</i>	ibid.	<i>Praying to Saints.</i>	p. 68, 69.
<i>Scripture and Tradition.</i>	p. 66.	<i>Image-worship.</i>	p. 69.
<i>Scripture in unknown Tongues.</i>	ibid.	<i>Sacraments, the Number of them.</i>	ibid.
<i>Merit.</i>	p. 67.	<i>Transubstantiation.</i>	p. 70.
		<i>Communion in one kind.</i>	ibid.
		<i>Solitary Masses.</i>	p. 70, 71.
		<i>Auricular Confession.</i>	p. 71.
		<i>Extream Unction.</i>	ibid.
		<i>Priests Marriage.</i>	ibid.
		<i>In all these Particulars Rome is not now what it hath been.</i>	

The Fourth Note, Amplitude, or Multitude, and Variety of Believers.

T <i>HE Scriptures first gave us the Notion of a Church.</i>	p. 73.	<i>Multitude, &c. is one.</i>	ibid.
<i>A true Christian Church professes the true Christian Faith.</i>	p. 74.	<i>What Bellarmine understands by this Note.</i>	p. 75.
<i>Instead of this the Church of Rome have invented several Notes and Characters of a Church, which are not to be met with, or are not plainly delivered in Scripture.</i>	ibid.	<i>In Answer to him.</i>	
<i>Of which this Amplitude, or</i>		<i>I. It is shewed this cannot be a Note of the true Church.</i>	ibid.
		<i>(1.) Whether you consider the Members thereof under either the Notion of a great Multitude, or (2.) a great Multitude of Believers.</i>	ibid.
			<i>Satan's</i>

The CONTENTS.

Satan's Kingdom more numerous than the Kingdom of Christ.
ibid.

The Worshippers of Mahomet exceed the Members of Christ's true Church in number, since the Romanists make themselves the only Catholics.
p. 76.

The Kingdom of Christ not to be distinguished from the Kingdom of Antichrist by this Note.
ibid.

This Note therefore no true Character of a Church.
p. 77.

The several Places of Scripture whence Bellarmine pretends he fetches this Note of his.
ibid.

This is so far from being a Note of the Church, that it is no more than the variable State and Condition of it.
p. 78.

This acknowledged by the Cardinal himself in his Explication of this Note.
ibid.

The present State of the Church not to be compared with what it shall be before the End of the World.
p. 79.

Many plain Prophecies brought for the Proof of this.
ibid.

The Cardinal's Citation of Vincentius Lirinensis for the confirming this Note considered.
p. 80, 81.

II. *Supposing this to be a true Note of the Catholick Church, it doth not advantage the Church of Rome, as to that her pretention of being the true Catholick Church.* ibid. 82, to 85.

III. *Supposing again this Note to be true, it doth the Reformed Churches a very great Service in demonstrating them to be true Parts of the Catholick Church.*
p. 85.

This demonstrated by two Arguments.
p. 86, 87.

1. *That in the first Ages of Christianity, the Catholick Church then was more ours, than now it is the Romanists.*
p. 86.

That there is a great Agreement between the antient Church of Rome, and the present Church of England. ibid.

This is evident by comparing the Doctrine and Worship of each together.
ibid.

2. *That upon computation the Churches subject to the Roman See exceed not the Reformed Churches in Amplitude, or Multitude of Members.*
p. 87, to 91.

The Conclusion.
p. 92.

The Fifth Note;

Succession of BISHOPS.

IN Examination of this Note,
Three Things are inquired in-
to.

I. How far this Note may be ne-
cessary to any Church. p. 94.
True and Lawful Pastors neces-
sary to the Constitution of the
Church, and this Pastoral
Power Originally from Christ.
ibid.

Power of Ordination entrusted
with Bishops, the chief Go-
vernors of the Church, and
ordinary Successors of the A-
postles. p. 94, 95.

The Government of the Church of
England by Bishops, and its
Succession, not interrupted in
the Reformation. ibid.

1. Obs. The Succession of Bishops
be necessary to the compleat
constitution of a Church, yet
it may be doubted, whether
it is indispensable to the ve-
ry being of it, so as to un-
church every place that wants
these.

2. Obs. It is not necessary for
every Church, which firmly
presumes upon this Lawful
and Orderly Succession even
from the Apostles, should be

able to produce the Records
of its conveyance thro' every
Age, and in every single Per-
son by whom it hath past.

p. 96.

The Antients contented them-
selves in delivering down to us
the Succession of Bishops in the
greater Sees and Mother-Ci-
ties: As of Rome, Alexan-
dria, Antioch, Jerusalem,
&c. ibid.

3. Obs. Some irregularities,
and uncanonical proceedings
in times of great Schisms, or
publick Disturbance have been
interpreted for no interrup-
tion of this Authentical Suc-
cession. p. 97.

II. How far the Succession of Bi-
shops may be granted to the
Church of Rome. p. 98.

Little left upon Record of many
of the first Bishops in the Church
of Rome, excepting their bare
Names. ibid.

If Heresie breaks the Succession,
this is chargeable upon the
Church of Rome. p. 99.

If Schismatical Intrusions can
dissolve the order of Successi-
on, this chargeable likewise on
the

The CONTENTS.

the Bishops of that Church,
viz. Felix the 2. and Vigilius.
ibid.

1. *The Case of the Roman*
Succession extreamly changed
since the first time. p. 101.
No Supremacy to be found in
the Church of Rome, for
more than the first 500 Years.

p. 101, 102.

2. *The Church of Rome not*
very favourable to the Or-
der of Bishops. *ibid.*

The Divine Right of Episcopacy
disputed in the Council of
Trent. *ibid.*

3. *Their Catechism makes this*
no distinct Order, but only a
different degree of the same
Priesthood. p. 103.

III. *How insufficient a proof this*
will afford them of any great
advantage? *ibid.*

1. *Succession is no sufficient e-*
vidence of the Truth of the
Doctrine of any Church.
p. 104, 105.

2. *An uninterrupted Succession*
of Bishops is no warrantable
ground of the Claim of Supe-
riority over another Church,
which hath not so clear evi-
dences thereof. p. 105, 106.

The Cardinals Testimonies out of
St. Augustine, Irenæus,
Tertullian, and Epiphanius,
examined. p. 107, 108.

His Inference from these citati-
ons about Succession considered.
p. 109, 110.

The Conclusion.

The Sixth Note,

Agreement in Doctrine with the Primitive Church.

This is acknowledged a True
Mark of a Church. p. 113.

The Infallibility of the present
Church is to be laid aside till
it be first known, whether it a-
grees with the Primitive
Church or not. p. 114.

The True Church only to be dis-

covered by the True Faith.
p. 115.

Those matters of Faith in Con-
troversie betwixt us are to be
determined by the Doctrines
and Practices of the Primi-
tive Church. p. 116.

The Church of Rome waving

The CONTENTS.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>Particular Controversies that may be made plain and evident to most capacities, delights rather to run out into General Controversies of Infallibility, Church-Authority, and resolution of Faith and Judge of Controversies, &c.</i> p. 119.</p> <p><i>The Reformation never did decline the Judgment of the Primitive Church, for its Justification.</i> p. 120, 121.</p> <p><i>Luther and Calvin misrepresented by Cardinal Bellarmine.</i> p. 122.</p> <p><i>The Apostolick Church, founded and governed by the Apostles over all the World, is the true Standard of the Christian Church.</i> ibid.</p> <p><i>The Scriptures the only Authentick Records of the Apostolick Church, and the only certain account we have of the Faith and Doctrine of the most Primitive Church.</i> p. 123.</p> <p><i>Several Doctrines Examined by Antiquity.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Supremacy not allowed of by the first Council of Nice, nor that of Constantinople, nor Chalcedon.</i> p. 125. 2. <i>Transubstantiation acknowledged by many of the Schoolmen, not to have been the Doctrine of the Primitive Church.</i> ibid. | <p><i>This Doctrine brought into the Church a little before Berengarius, and not thoroughly understood even then by those who held it.</i> p. 126.</p> <p><i>Berengarius his Recantation, and the Gloss upon it.</i> p. 127.</p> <p><i>The Number of the Sacraments not declared to be seven by the Primitive Church, nor mentioned by any Author till 1100 Years after Christ.</i> ibid.</p> <p><i>Necessity of Auricular Confession questioned by Learned Men in the times of Peter Lombard.</i> p. 128.</p> <p><i>Purgatory not mentioned by any Antient Writers.</i> p. 128, 129.</p> <p><i>Indulgences received very late into the Church.</i> ibid.</p> <p><i>Prayers and Oblations for the Dead, an Antient Practice, but no Doctrine of the Primitive Church.</i> ibid.</p> <p><i>Prayers in an unknown Tongue, never the Practice any where of the Primitive Church.</i> ib.</p> <p><i>Worship of Saints and Angels, and of Images, of no Antient date in the Church.</i> ibid.</p> <p><i>All these Doctrines of the Roman Church, which distinguish it from the Reformed, that they were not Doctrines of the Primitive Church, is further proved.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>From their Expurgatory Indices.</i> p. 130. 2. <i>From the Correcting, or rather</i> |
|---|--|

The CONTENTS.

- ther Corrupting the Fathers, and the counterfeiting so many false ones, and obtruding Spurious Authors upon the World.* p. 131, 132.
3. *From that little esteem and regard they too often have for Antiquity, when ever it makes against them.* p. 133.

4. *From the Determinations and Decrees of the Present Church, which are the only things they stick to, and which they prefer a thousand times before Antiquity, or the whole sence of the Primitive Church.*

The Seventh Note,

The Union of the Members among themselves, and with the Head.

UNity no proper Character of a true Church, because found upon Societies of different natures, and contrary designes.

p. 137.

It is a good mark, when 'tis a duty, as 'tis a duty when the terms of Union are so. *ibid.*

Wherein this Unity consists according to Bellarmine. p. 138.

Hereupon three things are endeavoured.

1. *That the Unity here offered is no true Note of the Church, forasmuch as Union with the Pope, as Head of the Church, hath no Foundation in Scripture, Reason, or Antiquity.* p. 140.

1. *Scripture.* p. 141, 142, 143.
 2. *No Foundation of it from Reason.* p. 144, 145.
 3. *Nor any Colour from Antiquity.* p. 145, to 149.
- The Cardinals Argument for the necessity of this Union, from Experience considered.* p. 149.
2. *The Union, which they pretend to among themselves, as Members, no certain Note of the Church.* p. 150.
1. *This is no more than what any Society may have as well as the true Church, and any other Church as well as the Roman.* p. 151.
 2. *As there may be this Union out of the true Church, so it may not be within it.* *ibid.*
- II. *If*

The CONTENTS.

II. *If Unity were a true Note of the Church, yet the Roman Church hath it not; which is probably true of the first, and most certainly true of the second branch of the Cardinals Unity.* p. 152.

1. *It is probable that there is not now, nor hath been for many Ages, any true Pope for the Church to be United to.* ibid.

2. *Neither is there that Union in all points of Doctrine amongst the Papists, or such a Union of their Members, as shall prevent the breaking away of some from the Communion of the rest.* p. 153.

Not that wonderful agreement, as the Cardinal pretends in the Sacred Writers of their Church, nor in the Decrees of their Lawful Councils, nor in those of their Popes.

p. 154.

Several Disputes between the Canonists and Schoolmen in many material points of Doctrine, between the Thomists, the Scotists and Occamists: between the Franciscans and Dominicans, about the conception of the Blessed Virgin, the Jansenists and Molinists.

p. 155, 156.

Bellarmin's Answer to all this, viz. They differ not in those things that belong to Faith,

considered. p. 156, 157.

The Cardinals difference between the division of Hereticks from the Church, and a division from Heresie, considered.

p. 158.

If there be in the Church of Rome a certain rule for ending Controversies, viz. The Sentence of the chief Pastor, or a definition of a General Council. ibid.

1. *Why were not these the means of composing those Controversies that carried us away from them?* ibid.

2. *How could those be certain means of composing Controversies, concerning which even in their own Church, there were the greatest Controversies of all?* p. 159.

This largely shewn from the Learned Launoys Epistle to Nicholas Gaineus upon this Question. p. 160, 161, 162, 163.

III. *That that Unity, which is indeed a Note of the Church, we Protestants have, and that in a much greater degree than they.* p. 164.

The true Grounds and Notions of Church - Unity represented. ibid.

1. *Unity of Submission to one Head, our Lord Jesus Christ.* ibid.

2. *Unity of professing the Common*

The CONTENTS.

mon Faith once delivered to to the Saints grounded upon the Authority of Scriptures, and summarily expounded in the Antient Creed. p. 165.

3. *Unity of Sacraments in the Church.* *ibid.*

4. *Unity of Obedience to all Institutions and Laws of Christ.* p. 165.

5. *Unity of Christian Affection and Brotherly kindness.* *ibid.*

6. *Unity of Discipline and Government.* *ibid.*

7. *Unity of Communion in the Service and Worship of God.* p. 166.

Some, tho' not all of these, necessary to the being of a Church, viz. The acknowledgment of our Lord, the profession of one Faith, and admission into the state of Christian Duties and Priviledges by one Baptism.

ibid.

Those particular Churches, which keep Unity in all these respects better than others do, have

the mark of Ecclesiastical Unity in a higher degree, than those others have. p. 167.

The Church of Rome as she holds, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, is part of the Catholick Church, and so far maintains Catholick Unity. *ibid.*

Wherein she departs from Catholick Unity, Purity and Charity, shewed in several instances. p. 167, 168.

The Church of England not chargeable on the same account. *ibid.* 168, 169.

Unity of Communion in the Church of Rome, is Unity of Communion amongst themselves, but not Catholick Unity of Communion, because the terms of it are many of them unlawful and unjust. p. 170.

The Contrary to which, the true Case of the Church of England. *ibid.* 171.

The Conclusion. p. 171, 172.

The Eighth Note, Sanctity of Doctrine.

T*hat this Note, as well as the others, is far from performing what is promised for it by the Cardinal, is sufficient-*

ly made evident by four Particulars. p. 173.

I. *What is here meant by Sanctity of*

of Doctrine? p. 174.

Tho' that is the best and purest Church, which hath the least of Error and Corruption in its Doctrine and Discipline, yet that, which is the best, is not the only true Church. p. 157.

II. That Sanctity of Doctrine, i.e. a pure profession of true Religion, without any mixture of Error, is no true Note or Character whereby a man may distinguish the true Church from all false Churches. p. 176.
That this can be no true Note of the true Church, made evidently appear from the consideration of those necessary Properties of all true Notes, by which Things are to be known and distinguished: p. 177.

These are Four.

1. Every true Note ought to be common to all, of the same kind with the thing which it notifies. p. 177, to 180.
2. Every true Note ought to be proper and peculiar to that kind of things of which it is a Note, and not common to Things of another kind. p. 181.
3. Every true Note ought to be more known, than the Thing which it notifies. p. 182, 183.
4. Every true Note ought to be inseparable to the Thing which it notifies. p. 184, to 188.

III. In what sense this may be a Note of the true Church. p. 189.
That is a true Church, which professes all the Essential Articles of Christian Faith; and receives all the Essential parts of Christian Worship and Discipline. p. 190.

The Church of England willing to be tried by this. p. 192.

IV. According to the Principles of the Church of Rome, the true Church is not to be found by this Note, in which soever of the two Senses we understand it. ibid.

This clearly made out in Four Particulars.

1. The Church of Rome decries mens private judgment of Discretion as utterly insufficient to make any certain distinction of Truth from Falshood in matters of Religion. p. 194.
2. Shee allows no sufficient Rule, without the true Church, to guide and direct our private Judgment of Discretion. p. 195.

Which is the true Church, not to be resolved by Principles of Nature, but those of Revelation. p. 196.

No other Rule, while we are out of the Church, to direct us in this

The CONTENTS.

*this Enquiry, but only that of
Scripture. ibid.*

*This the Church of Rome tells us
is insufficient, and that for two
Reasons.*

- 1. Because the Scripture is not
full enough, as to all Do-
ctrines of Faith and Man-
ners: And therefore there
are certain unwritten Tradi-
tions in the Church of equal
Authority with it, by which its
defects are supplied. p. 197.*
- 2. Because it is not clear enough,
the Sense of it being so ob-
scurely expressed, that we
can never be certain what it
is, without the interpretation*

of the true Church. p. 198.

These considered and answered.

- 3. The Church of Rome re-
solves all certainty, as to mat-
ters of Faith, into the Autho-
rity of the true Church, which
indeed is the Fundamental
Principle of Popery. p. 199.
A short Dialogue upon this Argu-
ment between a Papist and
Protestant. p. 200, to 202.*
- 4. The Church of Rome gives
Authority to the true Church
to impose upon us a necessity
of believing such Things, as
before they were not obliged
to believe. * p. 203. to the
End.*

The Ninth Note, Efficacy of Doctrine.

B*Y Efficacy of Doctrine, Two
Things understood.*

*Either (1.) The power which
the Word of God hath in the
hearts of particular men, to
dispose them to believe aright,
and to live well: Or, (2) That
Success which it hath in
drawing Multitudes outwardly
to profess and embrace it.*

p. 209.

*The first too inward, and the se-
cond (which is that which the
Cardinal understands by it)
too uncertain a thing to be a
Note of a True Church. ibid.
Many other things besides Efficacy
of Doctrine, which have
and may convert whole Nati-
ons to the Christian Religion,
such as hopes and fears, out-
ward force & necessity. p. 210.*

C

At

The CONTENTS.

An Instance hereof in the Conversions wrought by Charles the Great. p. 211.

The difference between such Conversions, and those which were made in the first Ages of the Church. p. 212.

In answer to the Cardinal upon this Note, Three things laid down.

I. *That the prevalency of any Doctrine can be no Note of a True Church.* p. 213.

This appears.

1. *From what our Saviour hath said in this matter.* *ibid.* 214.

2. *From the Consideration of the Temper and Constitution of Mankind.* p. 215, to 217.

3. *From plain matter of Fact.* p. 218, 219.

Error hath such an influence often upon mens minds, that they have rejected Truth, and preferred the most gross and impious Opinions before it. *ibid.*

This apparent from the Histories of all Ages. *ibid.*

More particularly in the Case of Arianism. p. 219.

And in that of Mahometanism. p. 220.

The Conversions wrought by those of the Greek Church whom the Church of Rome accounts Hereticks. p. 221.

The Efficacy of the Reformed Doctrine. *ibid.*

II. *That the Prevalency of the Doctrine professed in the Church of Rome, is no Note of its being a True Church.* p. 222.

And that for these reasons.

1. *Because of that great mixture of Errors which there is with the Truth, which it professes.* p. 223.

2. *Because the Doctrine of the Church of Rome is so much altered from what it formerly was.* *ibid.*

3. *Because it hinders those who embrace it from thoroughly examining it.* p. 224.

4. *Because Art and Force have sometimes been made use of to make it prevail.* p. 225.

III. *The Arguments, the Cardinal makes use of to prove this to be a Note of the True Church, proved to be Insufficient.* p. 226.

1. *His Arguments from the Scriptures considered* *ibid.*

2. *His Arguments from the prevalency of the Christian Doctrine in the beginning of the Church, examined.* p. 227.

3. *His Arguments from the particular Instances which he gives of Conversions wrought by those of the Church of Rome, reflected on.* p. 227.

1. *The Conversion of the English by Austin the Monk, considered.* p. 228.

Four

The CONTENTS.

Four Things alledged in answer to it. ibid.

2. *The Conversion of the People of Franconia by Kilia-
nus, replied to.* p. 228, 229.

3. *The Conversion of a great
part of Germany by Vi-
nofrid, otherwise called
Boniface, considered.* ibid.

*The Conversion of the Vandals,
of the Danes, of the Bulg-
arians Slavonians, &c. A-
scribed to other Causes, than*

*the naked Efficacy of the
Christian Doctrine.* ibid.

*The Barbarous Cruelties that
were used by the Spaniards in
the Conversion of the Indians.*

p. 230.

*The Instance of Heraclius the
Emperors Letter to Dagobert
King of France, concerning
the method he made use of for
the Conversion of the Jews.*

p. 231.

The Conclusion.

The Tenth Note,

Holiness of LIFE.

I*N this Argument it is shewn.*

I. *What the Notion of Holiness
is.* p. 233.

Holiness is of Two kinds.

1. *Holiness of Calling and De-
dication: What meant by
it?* p. 234.

2. *Holiness of Mind and Man-
ners: What understood by
it.* ibid.

II. *Neither of these kinds of Ho-
liness, can be properly called a
Note of the True Church.* ibid.
Not the first, because it apper-

*tains to its Essence and Con-
stitution shews what a Church;
is, and belongs to every Church
whether Greek, Abyssine,
Roman, or English.* p. 235.

*Not the Second kind, and that
for Three Reasons.*

1. *Because of that general ad-
mission of men of all Nations
and Conditions, upon their
profession of the common
Christianity into the bosome
of the Christian Church.*
p. 236.

2. *Because many men live some-
times with more, and some-*

The CONTENTS.

- times with less Morality.*
p. 237.
3. *Because a man must first understand the Nature and Doctrine of the Christian Church, or he cannot know what Sanctity is, and what that is in the Life of any man, which he is to take for the Holiness of a Christian.*
p. 238.
- III. *If Holiness of Life were a Note of the true Church, the Roman Church would not from this concession derive any great advantage.*
p. 239.
- Other Churches as famous as that of Rome for their Faith and manners.*
ibid.
- In latter Ages, the goodness of Morals in several of that Communion to be ascribed, not so much to Popery as its cause, but to those Principles that are common to all Christians.*
p. 240.
- The Reformation not free from bad Men, tho this proceeds from the Men, not from the Cause.*
ibid.
- Luther herein misrepresented by Bellarmine and others.*
p. 241.
- Great complaints of Corruptions (in the Romish Writers) in the Latin Church.*
p. 242.
- Many in the Romish Church infamous for their Impieties.*
p. 243.
- Reflections on Pope Gregory the Great [who is said to be the last of the good, and the first of the bad.]*
p. 244.
- On Pope John the XII.*
p. 245.
- On St. Dominick*
ibid.
- On the Austerities and Mortifications of their several Orders.*
p. 246.
- Many things in the Roman Church, which by helping forward an ill life do in part deface this mark of Sanctity.*
p. 248.

The Eleventh Note,

The Glory of Miracles.

Bellarmins Explication of this Note, and the grounds upon which he builds it.
p. 250.

In answer to this, Three things are laid down.

I. *That meer Miracles, without an*

The CONTENTS.

any other consideration, are not a sufficient Note of any Church or Religion whatever. p. 252.

The Miracles of the Primitive Church compared with those that are more peculiarly appropriated to the Church of Rome. p. 253.

The several Circumstances considered, which recommend the Primitive Miracles; viz.

1. That they were highly beneficial to Human Nature.

p. 254.

The Miracles of the Church of Rome (very many of them) defective herein. p. 255.

2. The Primitive Miracles of great importance and significance, and the design of them plainly laid down beforehand in the Prophecies of the V. T.

p. 256.

This applied to those of the Church of Rome. p. 257.

Miracles in the most comprehensive sense of the Word, are no proof of the Truth and Divinity of that Doctrine they would advance. p. 258.

This Instanced in those of Janes and Jambres, and of Apollonius Tyaneus. p. 259.

Photius his Censure of those of Apollonius Tyaneus. p. 260.

Miracles, whether supposed in a Heathen or a Heretick, not acknowledged by the Fathers to be

a good proof that either of them are in the right. p. 261.

This apparent from {
 St. Origen. ibid.
 St. Cyprian. ib.
 St. Irenæus. p. 162.
 St. Austin. p. 263.

II. Miracles of the Church of Rome no proof or confirmation of those Doctrines & Practices wherein the Reformed Church differs from them. p. 264.

Here three Things are considered.

1. That there is no ground throughout the whole Scriptures, to expect any Miracle for the Confirmation of any particular Doctrine whatever. p. 265.

This evident from the Mosaic dispensation. ibid.

The Christian Institution. p. 266.

The following Ages of the Church. ibid.

2. Many of those Doctrines, for which these Miracles are alledged, are so far from being asserted, or warranted in the Holy Scriptures, that they are rather contrary to them. ibid.

This Instanced in Transubstantiation.

Adoration of the Host.

Worshipping of Images.

Praying to Saints departed.

Purgatory, &c.

p. 266,
267.

Miracles

The CONTENTS.

Miracles for the advance or support of those Doctrines justly suspected. p. 268.

3. *No ground of certainty, as to matter of Fact, of most of those miracles which the Romanists make the Glory of their Church.* p. 269.

The Story of the Bones of Baby-las considered. *ibid.*

Those of Gervatius and Proat-tius revealed by Vision to St. Ambrose reflected on. p. 270.

The fabulous Stories of later Ages amongst them, condemned by several Writers of the Church of Rome. p. 271.

St. Bernard
reflected on. p. 273.
St. John Da-
mascen. p. 274.

Some Miracles wrought in con-firmation of Transubstantiati-on considered. p. 273, &c.

III. *We of the Reformed Religion, as we do not pretend to the Working of Miracles in our Age, so if we did, we could pretend to prove nothing by them, but what hath been al-ready sufficiently proved by the Miracles of Christ and his A-postles.* p. 280.

The Twelfth Note, The Light of Prophecy.

T*WO Things to be understood by the Light of Prophecy.*

1. *That Divine Revelation whereby a man is enabled to foretel such or such contin-gent Events will come to pass.*

p. 285.

2. *Or the Testimony that is gi-ven by the fulfilling of Pro-phecies to some Doctrine that was designed to be confirmed by it.*

p. 286.

In the latter sense it may be ad-

mitted as a mark, or rather an Argument of that Doctrin-e the Profession whereof makes the Church.

p. 287.

Great caution must be used in laying down the fulfilling the Predictions as an Argument to prove the Truth of Christia-nity. *ibid.*

Two Things here Examined.

- I. *Whether this be a Note of the Church?*

The

The CONTENTS.

- The Cardinal offers three Arguments to prove it.* p. 288.
- The first of them disproved, and the Prophecy of Joel applied by St. Peter (Acts 2. 16.) to the Church, explained and vindicated.* p. 289.
- His second Argument, that none knows future Contingences but God only, considered.* p. 290.
- His third Argument from the 18th of Deut. examined and overthrown.* p. 291.
- The foretelling of a future contingent Event, no certain Note of true Doctrine.* *ibid.*
- There have been true Prophecies among Heathens; the famous Acrostic of the Sybilla Erythraea, the Books of Hystaspes, the prediction of Balaam, which shew the gift of Prophecy not to be confined within the Communion of the Church.* p. 292, 293.
- Light of Prophecy no Note of the Church, because separable from it, there having been true Prophecy out of the Church, and because it hath not always continued in the Church.* p. 294.
- II. *If it was a Note, the Cardinal hath not sufficiently proved it belongs to his Church, and no others.* p. 295.
- His Instance of Agabus, and the Old Prophets, may serve any Christian Church as well, if not better than his.* *ibid.*
- His Instance of Gregory Thaumaturgus, Bishop of Caesaria, of Anthony an Egyptian Monk, of John an Anchorite, are nothing at all to his purpose.* p. 296.
- Neither are the Testimonies concerning St. Benedict, St. Bernard, and St. Francis.* p. 297, 298.
- The Nature of the Predictions & Prophecies brought to prove the Truth of the Gospel. The Church of Rome can pretend to few such.* p. 299, to 302.
- The Predictions of Philip Nereus, and of St. Rose.* p. 303.
- Of Hieronimus Savanorola.* p. 304.
- Of Johannes de Rupe Scissa.* p. 305.
- Of Luther and Melancthon, and John Hufs.* p. 306, 307.

The CONTENTS.

The Thirteenth Note,

The Confession of Adversaries.

THE Cardinal roundly affirms, the force of their Truth is so great, that the Enemies of it are constrained to bear Witness to it. p. 309.

I. Whether such a Testimony be indeed a Note of the Church? It is not, because the Church may be, and was without it in its Infancy, the Christian Religion being called Heresy by its Adversaries. p. 310, 311.

Our Saviour rather makes it a signe of the contrary, so doth Tertullian and others.

p. 312.

II. If it was a true Note, whether peculiar to the Church of Rome exclusively to other Christians, that are not of her Communion. p. 313.

The Witnesses he produces, nothing to the Purpose. Pliny's Testimony is in behalf of the Christians in general: and the same may be said, as to what he mentions of the Efficacy of the Prayers of the Christian Souldiers. p. 314, 315.

Josephus his Testimony makes as little for him or his Church. p. 316.

Neither is there any advantage arising to them from that of Philo the Jew. p. 317.

His other Witnesses both Turks and Hereticks, trifling and insignificant. p. 318.

The Cardinal affirms, that whereas the Catholicks neither praise or approve the Doctrine or Life of Heathens or Hereticks, yet these speak well of them.

p. 319.

Uncharitableness a true Character of the Church of Rome. ibid.

Catholicks have commended the Lives both of Heathens and Hereticks. p. 320.

And also our Doctrines. p. 321, to 324.

Slater's Consensus Veterum reflected on. ibid.

The Testimony of the Jews, how far useful to Christianity.

p. 324.

The Jews as to matter of Fact confess there was such a man as JESUS, who wrought wonderful Works. ibid.

Their Testimony as to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament, as to the promise of the Messias;

The CONTENTS.

Messias; and as to the Interpretation of those Texts appropriated to the Messias.
p. 325.
Mr. Slaters Ignorance of the

Jewish Writers discovered, from p. 326 to 330.
The Jewish Writers, great Enemies to the New Doctrines of the Roman Church. p. 133.

The Fourteenth Note,

The unhappy End of the Churches Enemies.

What Bellarmine means by an unhappy end. p. 335.
This intended by him not barely as a Note of a Church, but of that which is the only true Church. p. 336.

The Instances he produces of unhappy Deaths, are for the greater part of them Impertinent. ibid.

The unhappy end of those who defend it must be a Note of a false Church, if the unhappy end of those who oppose it be a Note of the True.

p. 337.
From God's Judgments against particular Persons, nothing can be concluded against that Church of which they are Members. ibid.

This therefore no Note of the True Church, as being contrary, 1. To Scripture, p. 338, 339. †

2. *To Daily Observation, and the History of the foregoing Ages.* p. 340, 341.

3. *To the Principles of Reason.* p. 342.

This proved in five particulars. p. 342, 343, 344.

Supposing it to be a Note of the true Church, the Protestant will be found to be the True Church rather than the Church of Rome. p. 344.

This will be evident by comparing the Deaths of their prime Members and Zealous Champions and then considering on which side we find the greater number of such as are unnatural and not common to men.

p. 345.
Protestant Bishops and other Eminent Pastors amongst them without number, have died the most happy Deaths. ibid.

D The

The CONTENTS.

The number of those who have met with unhappy ends very few. p. 346.

Five only mentioned by our Adversary: Luther, Zuinglius, Oecolampadius, Carlostadius, and Calvin. ibid.

The Death of Luther misrepresented by them. p. 347.

Sleidans Account of it, and Father Pauls, Thuanus, quite different from that of his bitter Enemies. p. 348, 349.

Zuinglius his Death, another Instance of Bellarmines.

p. 350.

Oecolampadius his Death falsely related by the Cardinal. ibid.

And Carlostadius his being killed by the Devil, exposed as a notorious Forgery by Petrus Roquinius. p. 351.

The Story of Calvin's Death

largely considered, and proved to be so lewd a Calumny, that any man but an Advocate for their Church might be ashamed to own it. p. 351 to 359.

No mention made by the Cardinal, of any unhappy Ends of those Princes and Secular Powers, who have been great Defenders of the Protestant Faith. p. 360.

Several dismal Ends of Cardinals in the Church of Rome, but especially of their Popes.

p. 362, 361, 362.

The unhappy Deaths of several of their Princes, particularly five Successively together in France. p. 363.

The Advantage therefore on this account on the Protestant side. ibid.

Conclusion.

The

The Fifteenth Note,
Temporal Felicity.

THis Note, even in the Cardinal's Opinion, liable to many exceptions; and therefore, at once to prevent them all, he tells us roundly, that Catholick Princes never adhered unto God heartily, but that they most easily triumphed over their Enemies. p. 368.

I. This cannot be esteemed a Note of the Church.

1. Because God hath no where promised it in all the Holy Gospel. p. 369.

2. Because for several Ages together the Church could not pretend to any such thing as Temporal Felicity. p. 370.

3. Because of those miseries which the Church of God must endure in the Dayes of Antichrist. p. 371.

II. The Historical Passages which the Cardinal produces for this Note. do not prove what he intends. p. 372.

Great Partiality made use of in the choice of these Instances. p. 373.

The Story of Rhadagaisus and his Son's Death, the defeat of the numerous Army of the Goths by Honorius, considered. ibid.

The various Successes of the Holy-War, did at last conclude to the Advantages of the Infidels. p. 374.

The Story of the Albigenes, and the successes of both sides impartially related, wherein these Hereticks seem clearly to have the advantage. p. 375, 376, 377.

The Victory of Charles the V. no such mighty Miracle as pretended. p. 378.

Many Examples of Infidels and Hereticks alledged, who have been as prosperous and successful in the World, as any Catholicks can pretend to. p. 379.

The History of Uladisslaus King of Poland and Hungary, upon his rupture of the Peace with Amurath the Second. p. 380.

The Unfortunate Battel of Mohatz related. p. 381.

The CONTENTS.

*The Prosperous Reign of Queen
Elizabeth, notwithstanding
all the attempts both of For-
reign and Domestick Enemies.
p. 381. to 387.
The Author of the use and great*

*moment of the Notes of the
Church, reflected upon.*

p. 388. 389.

*The Recapitulation and Conclu-
sion to the whole Work.*

p. 390.

F I N I S.

Books

Books Printed for, and Sold by Richard Chiswell.

- Dr. **Cave's** Lives of the Primitive Fathers, in 2 Vol. *Folio*.
 Dr. **Cary's** Chronological Account of Ancient Time. *fol.*
Hooker's Ecclesiastical Policy. *fol.*
 Sir **John Bury's** History of the Irish Rebellion. *fol.*
 The Laws of this Realm concerning Jesuits, Seminary Priests, Recusants, the Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance, explained by divers Judgments and Resolutions of the *Judges*; with other Observations thereupon. By *William Cavley Esq;*. *fol.*
 Dr. **Townson's** Explication on the Creed, the Commandments, and Lord's Prayer, in 3 Vol. *fol.*
 Bishop **Nicholson** on the Church-Catechism. 40.
 Mr. **John Cave's** seven occasional Sermons. 40.
 Bishop **Wilkin's** Natural Religion. 80.
 ---His Fifteen Sermons. 80.
 Mr. **Tanner's** *Primordia*: Or, the Rise and Growth of the first Church of God described. 80.
Spaniards Conspiracy against the State of *Venice*. 80.
 Dr. **Cave's** Primitive Christianity, in three parts. 80.
 Certain genuine Remains of the Lord *Bacon*, in Arguments Civil, Moral, Natural, &c. with a large account of all his Works. By Dr. *Tho. Tenison*. 80.
 Dr. **Henry Bagshaw's** Discourses on select Texts. 80.
 Mr. **Seller's** State of the Church in the three first Centuries.
 Dr. **Burnet's** Account of the Life and Death of the Earl of *Rochester*. 80.
 ---Vindication of the Ordinations of the Church of *England*. 80.
 ---History of the Rights of Princes in the Disposing of Ecclesiastical Benefices and Church-lands. 80.
 ---Relation of the present state of the difference between the *French King* and the Court of *Rome*; to which is added, the Pope's Brief to the Assembly of the Clergy, and their Protestation, published by Dr. *Burnet*. 80.
 Dr. **Cumber's** Companion to the Altar. 80.
 Dr. **Shellock's** Practical Discourse of Religious Assemblies. 80.
 ---Defence of Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Unreasonableness of Separation. 80.
 ---A Vindication of the Defence of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, in answer to Mr. *Baxter* and Mr. *Lob* about Catholick Communion. 80.
 Sir **Rob. Filmer's** *Patriarcha*, or natural Power of Kings. 80.
 Bishop **Wattenball's** Method and Order for private Devotion. 12s.
Valentine's Private Devotions. 40.
 Dr. **Spencer de Legibus Hebræorum Ritualibus & earum Rationibus**. *fol.*
 Dr. **John Lightfoot's** Works in *English*, in 2 Vol. *fol.*
 Sir **Tho. Brown's** Vulgar Errors, with all the rest of his Works. *fol.*
Patris Simonii Disquisitiones Criticæ de Variis per diversa Loca & Tempora Bibliorum Editionibus. Accedunt Castigat. Opusc. Jf. Vossii de Sibyllinis Oraculis. 40.
 The Case of Lay-Communion with the Church of *England* considered. 40.
 Two Letters betwixt Mr. *R. Smith*, and Dr. *H. Hammond*, about Christ's Descent into Hell. 80.
 Dean **Stratford's** Dissuasive from Revenge. 80.

Books lately Printed for Richard Chiswell.

Dr. *Hex*, *Burton's* first Volume of Discourses ; of Purity and Charity ; of Repentance, and of seeking the Kingdom of God. Published by Dean *Tillotson*. 8o.
 Sir *Thomas More's Utopia*, newly made English by Dr. *Burnet*. 8o.
 Mr. *Seller's* Devout Communicant ; assisted with Rules, Meditations, Prayers, and Anthems. 12s.
 Dr. *Towerson* of the Sacraments in General.
 —Of the Sacrament of Baptism in particular. 8o.

The History of the *COUNCIL of TRENT*: in which, besides the Ordinary Acts of the Council, are declared many notable Occurrences which hapned in Christendom for 40 Years, and particularly the Practices of the *COURT of ROME* to hinder the *Reformation of Their Errors*, and to maintain *Their Greatness*. Written by *Father Paul* of the *SERVI*. To which is added, the *Life of the Author*, and the *History of the Inquisition*.

Books lately Printed for Richard Chiswell.

Dr. *Burnet's* History of the Reformation of the Church of *England*, in 2 Vol. *Fol.*
 A Collection of Sixteen several Tracts, and Discourses. Written in the Years, from 1678, to 1685. inclusive, by *Gilbert Burnet*, D. D. To which are added, A Letter written to Dr. *Burnet*, giving an Account of Cardinal *Poole's* Secret Powers. The History of the *Powder-Treason*, with a Vindication of the Proceedings thereupon. An Impartial Consideration of the Five Jesuits dying Speeches, who were Executed for the Popish Plot, 1679. 4o.

A Dissertation concerning the Government of the *Ancient Church*: more particularly of the Encroachments of the *Bishops of Rome* upon other *Sees*. By *WILLIAM CAVE*, D. D. *Octavo*.

An Answer to Mr. *Servant's* [Sure Footing in Christianity] concerning the Rule of Faith: With some other Discourses. By *WILLIAM FALKNER*, D. D. 4o.

A Vindication of the Ordinations of the *Church of England*; in Answer to a Paper written by one of the *Church of Rome*, to prove the Nullity of our Orders. By *GILBERT BURNET*, D. D. *Octavo*.

An Abridgment of the History of the Reformation of the *Church of England*. By *GILB. BURNET*, D. D. *Octavo*.

The *APOLOGY* of the *Church of England*; and an Epistle to one Signior *Scipio*, a *Venetian* Gentleman, concerning the Council of *Trent*. Written both in Latin, by the Right Reverend Father in God, *JOHN JEWEL* Lord Bishop of *Sarum*: Made English by a Person of Quality. To which is added, The Life of the said Bishop: Collected and written by the same Hand. *Octavo*.

The Life of *WILLIAM BEDEL*, D. D. Bishop of *Kilmore* in *Ireland*. Together with *Certain Letters* which passed betwixt him and *James Waddesworth* (a late Pensioner of the Holy Inquisition of *Sevil*) in Matters of Religion, concerning the General Motives to the *Roman Obedience*. *Octavo*.

The Decree made at *ROME* the Second of *March*, 1679. condemning some Opinions of the *Jesuits*, and other *Casuits*. *Quarto*.

A Discourse concerning the Necessity of Reformation, with respect to the Errors and Corruptions of the *Church of Rome*. *Quarto*. First and Second Parts. A

Books lately Printed for Richard Chiswell

A Discourse concerning the Celebration of Divine Service in an Unknown Tongue. *Quarto.*

A Papist not Misrepresented by Protestants. Being a Reply to the Reflections upon the Answer to [A Papist Misrepresented and Represented]. *Quarto.*

An Exposition of the Doctrine of the *Church of England*, in the several Articles proposed by the late BISHOP of *CONDOM*, [in his Exposition of the Doctrine of the *Catholic Church*]. *Quarto.*

A Defence of the Exposition of the Doctrine of the *Church of England*; against the Exceptions of Monsieur de *Meaux*, late Bishop of *Condom*, and his Vindicator. 40.

A *CATECHISM* explaining the Doctrine and Practices of the *Church of Rome*. With an Answer thereunto. By a *Protestant* of the *Church of England*. 80.

A Papist Represented and not Misrepresented: being an Answer to the First, Second, Fifth and Sixth Sheets of the Second Part of the [Papist Misrepresented and Represented]; and for a further Vindication of the *CATECHISM*, truly representing the Doctrines and Practices of the *Church of Rome*. *Quarto.*

The *Lay-Christian's* Obligation to read the Holy Scriptures. *Quarto.*

The *Plain Man's* Reply to the *Catholic Missionaries*. 240.

An Answer to *THREE PAPERS* lately printed, concerning the Authority of the *Catholic Church* in Matters of Faith, and the Reformation of the *Church of England*. *Quarto.*

A Vindication of the Answer to *THREE PAPERS* concerning the Unity and Authority of the *Catholic Church*, and the Reformation of the *Church of England*. *Quarto.*

Mr. *Chillingworth's* Book, called [The Religion of Protestants a safe way to Salvation] made more generally useful by omitting Personal Contests, but inserting whatsoever concerns the common Cause of Protestants, or defends the *Church of England*, with an exact Table of Contents; and an Addition of some genuine Pieces of Mr. *Chillingworth's*, never before Printed, viz. against the *Infallibility* of the *Roman Church*, *Transubstantiation*, *Tradition*, &c. And an Account of what moved the Author to turn Papist, with his Confutation of the said Motives.

An Historical Treatise written by an AUTHOR of the *Communion* of the *CHURCH of ROME*, touching *TRANSUBSTANTIATION*. Wherein is made appear, That according to the Principles of *THAT CHURCH*, This Doctrine cannot be an Article of Faith. 40.

The Protestant's Companion: Or an Impartial Survey, and Comparison of the *Protestant Religion* as by Law established, with the main *Doctrines of Popery*. Wherein is shewed, that Popery is contrary to Scripture, Primitive Fathers and Councils; and that proved from Holy Writ, the Writings of the Ancient Fathers for several hundred Years, and the Confession of the most Learned Papists themselves. 40.

The Pillar and Ground of Truth. A Treatise shewing that the *Roman Church* falsely claims to be *That Church*, and the Pillar of *That Truth* mentioned by *S. Paul* in his first Epistle to *Timothy*, Chap. 3. Vers. 15. 40.

The Peoples Right to read the Holy Scripture Asserted. 40.

A Short Summary of the principal Controversies between the *Church of England* and the *Church of Rome*; being a Vindication of several Protestant Doctrines, in Answer to a Late Pamphlet, Intituled, [Protestancy disprove of Scripture Proofs.] 40.

An Answer to a Late Pamphlet, Intituled, [The Judgment and Doctrine of the Clergy of the *Church of England* concerning one Special Branch of the King's Prerogative, viz. In dispensing with the Penal Laws.] 40. A

Books lately Printed for Richard Chiswell.

A Discourse of the *Holy Eucharist* in the two great Points of the *Real Presence*, and the *Adoration of the Host*; in Answer to the *Two Discourses* lately Printed at Oxford on this Subject: To which is prefixed a Large Historical Preface relating to the same Argument.

Two Discourses; Of Purgatory, and Prayers for the Dead.

The Fifteen *Notes of the Church*, as laid down by Cardinal *Bellarmin*, examined and confuted. 4°. With a Table of the Contents.

Preparation for Death: Being a Letter sent to a young Gentlewoman in France, in a dangerous Dissemper of which she died. By *W. W.* 12°.

The Difference between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, in opposition to a late Book, intituled, *An Agreement between the Church of England and Church of Rome*.

A *PRIVATE PRAYER* to be used in Difficult Times.

A True Account of a Conference held about Religion at London, Sept. 29, 1687, between *A. Pulton*, Jesuit, and *Tho. Tenison*, D. D. as also of that which led to it, and followed after it. 4°.

The Vindication of *A. Cressener*, Schoolmaster in Long-Acre, from the Aspersions of *A. Pulton*, Jesuit, Schoolmaster in the Savoy; together with some Account of his Discourse with Mr. *Meredith*.

A Discourse shewing that Protestants are on the safer Side, notwithstanding the uncharitable Judgment of their Adversaries; and that *Their Religion* is the surest Way to Heaven. 4°.

Six Conferences concerning the *Eucharist*, wherein is shewed, that the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* overthrows the Proofs of Christian Religion.

A Discourse concerning the pretended Sacrament of *Extreme Onction*; with an account of the Occasions and Beginnings of it in the Western Church. In Three Parts. With a Letter to the Vindicator of the Bishop of Condom.

The Pamphlet entituled, *Speculum Ecclesiasticum*, or an Ecclesiastical Prospective-Glass, considered, in its false Reasonings and Quotations. There are added, by way of Preface, two further Answers, the First, to the Defender of the *Speculum*; the Second to the Half-sheet against the *Six Conferences*.

A Second Defence of the Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England, against the new Exceptions of *Monsieur de Meaux*, late Bishop of Condom, and his Vindicator. The FIRST PART. In which the Account that has been given of the Bishop of Meaux's Exposition, is fully Vindicated; the Distinction of Old and New Popery Historically asserted; and the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, in Point of *Image-worship*, more particularly considered. 4°.

The Incurable Scepticism of the Church of Rome. By the Author of the [*Six Conferences concerning the Eucharist*.] 4°.

Mr. Pulton Considered in his Sincerity, Reasonings, Authorities: Or a Just Answer to what he hath hitherto Published in his *True Account*; his *True and full Account of a Conference*, &c. His *Remarks*; and in them his pretended Confutation of what he calls Dr. T's *Rule of Faith*. By *Tho. Tenison*, D. D.

A Full View of the Doctrines and Practices of the *Antient Church* relating to the *Eucharist*, wholly different from those of the *Present Roman Church*, and inconsistent with the Belief of *Transubstantiation*. Being a sufficient Confutation of *CONSENSUS VETERUM*, *NUBES TESTIUM*, and other *Late Collections* of the *Fathers* pretending to the Contrary. 4°.



